

February 8, 1966

the troubleshooter, and James Jackson and Arnold Johnson.

WHY COMMIES COACH THE COLLEGE REBELS

Most of them have been out there pitching around the college campuses. As FBI Director Hoover tells it: "The unvarnished truth is that the Communist conspiracy is seizing this insurrectionary climate (on some college campuses) to captivate the thinking of rebellious-minded youth and coax them into the Communist movement itself or at least agitate them into serving the Communist cause."

So the new left will be back picketing around the White House tomorrow, or next week, many of the marchers perhaps unmindful of the potential danger to the country packed into the mouthings of the old faces in the near background.

Some demonstrators not yet thoroughly hooked might find it profitable to think over the closing lines in the memoirs of retired Gen. Curtis LeMay, the old bomber man. He had a parting thought for a younger generation:

"I hope that the United States of America has not yet passed the peak of honor and beauty and that our people can still sustain certain simple philosophies at which some miserable souls feel it incumbent to sneer. I refer to some of the Psalms and to the Gettysburg Address and the Scout oath. I refer to the Lord's Prayer and to that other oath, which a man must take when he stands with hand uplifted and swears that he will defend his country."

The soul can get pretty miserable walking the sidewalk in front of the White House on a day like this.

[From the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, Feb. 1, 1966]

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

(By John Edgar Hoover, Director)

The American college student today is being subjected to a bewildering and dangerous conspiracy perhaps unlike any social challenge ever before encountered by our youth. On many campuses he faces a turbulence built on unrestrained individualism, repulsive dress and speech, outright obscenity, disdain for moral and spiritual values, and disrespect for law and order. This movement, commonly referred to as the "new left," is complex in its deceitful absurdity and characterized by its lack of commonsense.

Fortunately, a high percentage of the more than 3 million full-time college students are dedicated, hardworking, and serious-minded young people; however, their good deeds and achievements are greatly overshadowed by those who are doing a tremendous amount of talking but very little thinking.

Much of this turmoil has been connected with a feigned concern for the vital rights of free speech, dissent, and petition. Hard-core fanatics have used these basic rights of our democratic society to distort the issues and betray the public. However, millions of Americans, who know from experience that freedom and rights also mean duties and responsibilities, are becoming alarmed over the anarchistic and seditious ring of these campus disturbances. They know liberty and justice are not possible without law and order.

The Communist Party, U.S.A., as well as other subversive groups, is jubilant over these new rebellious activities. The unvarnished truth is that the Communist conspiracy is seizing this insurrectionary climate to captivate the thinking of rebellious-minded youth and coax them into the Communist movement itself or at least agitate them into serving the Communist cause. This is being accomplished primarily by a two-pronged offensive—a much-publicized college speaking program and the campus-oriented Com-

munist W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America. Therefore, the Communist influence is cleverly injected into civil disobedience and reprisals against our economic, political, and social system.

There are those who scoff at the significance of these student flareups, but let us make no mistake: the Communist Party does not consider them insignificant. The participants of the new left are part of the 100,000 "state of mind" members Gus Hall, the party's general secretary, refers to when he talks of party strength. He recently stated the party is experiencing the greatest upsurge in its history with a "one to two thousand" increase in membership in the last year.

For the first time since 1959, the party plans a national convention this spring. We can be sure that high on the agenda will be strategy and plans to win the new left and other new members. A Communist student, writing in an official party organ, recently stated, "There is no question but that the new left will be won."

Thus, the Communists' intentions are abundantly clear. We have already seen the effects of some of their stepped-up activities, and I firmly believe a vast majority of the American public is disgusted and sickened by such social orgies. One recourse is to support and encourage the million of youth who refuse to swallow the Communist bait. Another is to let it be known far and wide that we do not intend to stand idly by and let demagogues make a mockery of our laws and demolish the foundation of our Republic.

EXPORT SURPLUS A \$7 BILLION MIRAGE

(Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Commerce recently issued a report on our balance of trade for 1965. According to that report this country ran up an export surplus of \$5.2 billion last year.

This was a decline of \$1.5 billion from the surplus reported for 1964, which was given as \$6.7 billion. The setback came from an import increase of 14 percent in 1965 over 1964 while exports rose only 4 percent.

Even so, the 1965 surplus of \$5.2 billion is nothing to be sneezed at. Too bad then that it is a mirage, a myth, a figment of a numbers game, or what you will.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Department of Commerce, our 1965 imports came to \$21.36 billion, compared with exports of \$26.56 billion. These are pretty figures to contemplate. Unfortunately for our inclination to complacency, our imports were not \$21.36 billion but more nearly \$25 billion. The discrepancy comes from the way the Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce record our import statistics. They base them on foreign value, as if it cost nothing to bring the goods to our shores. Everyone of us knows that this adds up to a false representation. What is worse, this country incurred a deficit of \$227 million in 1964 in its international transportation account—Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1965, table 844.

Several months ago I inserted in the RECORD a calculation provided by O. R.

Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, in which he estimated the average global burden of freight and insurance on our total imports. His estimate, based on our trade with England and Japan, was 17½ percent for our trade with the world as a whole. I have no reason for questioning Mr. Strackbein's estimate. It was well documented.

Virtually all other countries record their imports on a c.i.f. basis, which includes not only the cost but also insurance and freight charges incurred in bringing the goods from the foreign port to the port of entry. This is what we should do as a basis for reporting our imports. Because of the method we follow our imports are undervalued by the amount of the shipping charges, including insurance.

That is why it creates the wrong impression to report that our 1965 imports were only \$21.36 billion when it cost some \$3.7 billion more to bring the goods to our ports of entry. We swell our breasts with pride over our ability to compete with other countries. Well, at this point we should release \$3.7 billion of this air from our lungs and bring in our chest by that much.

On the export side, in order to feel good and in order to prove that the trade agreements program has been a huge success, we commit an equally unpardonable sin—one of about the same proportions as the one just described.

Our executive departments—not including Agriculture which should be given honorable mention for showing the volume of farm exports generated by Public Law 480 and Federal subsidies of wheat, cotton, and so forth—namely, Treasury and Commerce, have not been satisfied to show our private commercial exports, free of vast subsidies, but include giveaways, sales for foreign inedible currencies and seemingly whatever else they can lay their hands on. They do leave military shipments out of total exports, but that is about the only place where they draw the line.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how large the 1965 exports were under Public Law 480, AID, and so forth, but in 1964 the combined exports generated in this fashion plus those called commercial—because they were sold through private channels but were subsidized—amounted to \$3.7 billion. The outstanding ones among the so-called commercial sales were wheat, wheat flour, and cotton. Our disposal of these products did nothing to prove our competitive capacity. Quite the contrary. Without the subsidies we could not have met the world price and could only have sold at cut prices, if at all.

It is safe to say that the 1965 exports under AID, Public Law 480, and so forth, were at least equal to the \$3.7 billion of 1964.

Add this to the \$3.7 billion by which we undervalued our imports in 1965 and we reach a total of \$7.4 billion. This is a respectable distortion.

Reduce our reported exports of \$26.56 billion by \$3.7 billion and the figure drops to \$22.9 billion. This operation might be called trimming away the blubber and streamlining our figures. Compare

Appendix

The Job Corps in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the Job Corps program in Idaho has recently become a subject of national interest. To assure that the membership is kept fully informed on current developments, I offer for publication in the RECORD the following three newspaper articles:

[From the Owyhee (Idaho) Nugget, Feb. 10, 1966]

MARSING JOB CORPSMEN GRADUATE FROM CENTER

Two corpsmen, Roland Bland and Jeffery Bolden, Jr., received certificates of completion February 7, 1966 at the Marsing Job Corps Conservation Center.

ROLAND BLAND

Roland Bland, 17, is from Petersburg, Va. and was transferred to the Marsing Center from Curlew Job Corps Conservation Center, Curlew, Wash., on October 25, 1965. He originally entered the Job Corps program June 10, 1965. Roland was promoted to assistant corpsman leader while at Curlew and was promoted to corpsman leader when he arrived at Marsing. He was sent to our center to assist us by providing corpsman leadership at our initial stages.

While at Marsing he was assigned duties of teacher's aid and as work leader. He performed these duties in an excellent manner. He previously completed the education program while at Curlew Job Corps Conservation Center. Roland was transferred to Kilmer Job Corps Urban Center in Edison, N.J., to further his training in his desired trade skills of machinist and welding.

This Urban Center has a maximum enrollment of 2,500 corpsmen and Roland will be able to stay up to a maximum of 2 years at this center starting from the time he entered the Job Corps in June 1965

JEFFERY BOLDEN

Jeffery Bolden, Jr., 20, is from Mount Vernon, Ala., and came to this center November 23, 1965. Jeffery excelled in the education and work program and progressed rapidly. He advanced from the Job Corps fourth level to the ninth level in approximately 3 months and has completed the basic education program. He also has learned and practiced basic work attitudes and skills.

His qualifications were discussed with the employment service at his hometown and they stated that with his basic knowledge, work habits and attitudes, he can have a choice of several jobs at the present time. Because he has completed the basic education-work program and has been assured of job placement, he has fulfilled the purpose of the Job Corps program and was graduated to become a taxpayer.

[From the Owyhee (Idaho) Nugget, Feb. 10, 1966]

MARSING JOB CORPS CENTER TO EXPAND TO 168 CORPSMEN

Enrollees at the Marsing Job Corps Conservation Center will be increased by 56 corpsmen by June 15, from the 112 now at the Center, reported Daniel Weir, regional Job Corps coordinator, Bureau of Reclamation, and Cleve S. Bolingbroke, Center director. This will make a total of 168 corpsmen, and the staff will be increased from the present 31 to 47.

"By expanding the Center," the men said, "it will mean a far better vocational training program in automotive maintenance, heavy equipment operation, concrete and brick work, carpentry, welding, and many more vocational trades. More and better equipment will be brought to the site.

Over \$150,000 will be spent at the Center between now and June 15 for expanded facilities which will include a new 56-man dormitory, a 1,000-square-foot dispensary, a new gym 90 by 96 feet, and a new shop building.

Plans are being formulated to develop the corpsmen's social abilities and help them find a better place in society.

Wednesday morning Mr. Weir, Mr. Bolingbroke, E. R. Indreland, deputy director of the Marsing Job Corps works program, met with Marsing Mayor Dave Haken, and Harold Curt, president of the Marsing Rod and Gun Club, to discuss plans on beautifying the Marsing Island Park. The Center plans to spend several thousand dollars on the island project, which should make a beautiful place for all to enjoy.

[From the Cottonwood (Idaho) Chronicle, Feb. 10, 1966]

The need for better communication between citizens of Cottonwood and the surrounding communities and the Job Corps Conservation Center at Cottonwood has been recognized since the opening of the camp and the arrival of the corpsmen at the Center.

In November, a group of public-spirited citizens of Cottonwood from social-action groups and churches met with the staff at the Center and established a coordinating council. This council has now become a point of contact between the town and the camps.

On February 1 the group met for the first time in the new year, to continue discussions of ways and means for interesting other organizations of the community in the work at the Job Corps Center, and especially to devise methods for establishing more points of contact between the two groups.

It was felt that one of the important ways in which men and women of Cottonwood could observe the educational facilities and the accomplishments of the Job Corps conservation crews was by actual visits to the camp. During these visits, the staff and various counselors and instructors could answer questions and explain the educational and vocational facilities open to the corpsmen. The boys, themselves, would be available for answering questions about their life at the Center and in the

forest "spike camps" to which they go voluntarily for ranger training and experience.

Another effective form of communication, it was felt, would be having some of the young men attend open meetings of the social-action groups in Cottonwood to observe how these function—especially how various community projects are proposed, carried out, completed, or tabled. They also hope some of the women's organizations might participate, so a broader understanding of the aims and objectives of the program of the Job Corps might lessen the communication gap between the town and the Center.

Attending the meeting were Len Kuther, chairman; Cletus Uhlorn for the business community, Bud Walkup and Ladd Arnot; Center Director Robert R. Lusk, Margaret Raymond, VISTA Volunteer; Sam Jordan, and Otto H. Ost.

An Important Warning for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Samuel F. Pryor has just returned from a tour of all of our bases in southeast Asia and has made some very important observations which should serve as a warning for the future.

Some of his conclusions are given in the following column by Ruth Montgomery which appeared in the New York Journal American of February 11, 1966:

CAPITAL LETTER: WHAT IF RED CHINA HAD OUR MUSCLE?

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—A nongovernmental aviation expert who directed the development of 50 overseas military airfields during World War II has just returned from a comprehensive tour of all U.S. bases in southeast Asia. His conclusion: President Johnson has been right every step of the way in his Vietnam policy.

Samuel F. Pryor, longtime executive of Pan American World Airways, made the trip in company with our Air Force Pacific Commander in Chief, Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr.

Having convinced himself of the rightness of our policy—both the lull and the resumed bombing—Pryor reserves his scorn for those who say that America should pull out of the area. He has this word of warning for the doves, and for the fence-sitting nations of the world:

"Add together our guided missile program, our ICBM's and nuclear capacity, our Air Force, Polaris submarines, Navy, Marines, artillery and Army, and you have the greatest military strength in the history of mankind. Couple this with our productive capacity, which is half of the entire world's,

and imagine what would happen if the Red Chinese possessed this strength.

"They'd be in Moscow and Paris, Africa and South America right now, and half of our American cities would be bombed out. Let's face facts. Do we want this to happen to our children, or do we want to stop the Red Chinese now? Do we want them to overrun southeast Asia and Thailand, and then pick off sparsely settled Australia? That's our choice."

Pryor visited every U.S. base in South Vietnam, Taiwan, and Okinawa, plus all the "military assistance" places in Thailand. From long experience he says that no war is kind, but that we are "fighting a kind war in Vietnam." He explains that during the recent bombing lull, the President was in effect saying to the Vietcong: "Now you see what's happening. Please stop. We don't want to hurt you."

When the Reds refused to listen to the voice of reason, Pryor thinks the President had "no alternative but to give them another taste of our strength." He also assures the hawks that the lull was by no means wasted on our side.

We were using that period, he says, to build up "tremendous strength," and through intelligence and flyovers to gage the capability of the enemy in rebuilding its bombed-out bridges and supply roads.

As a narcotics expert, Pryor looked into the smuggling problem during the Asian tour. The contraband drugs are moving out of Red China into the black markets of the world, and Pryor says: "Heroin is the stuff you would only want your enemies to use. Red China has a strict ban on its use by its own people, but it is moving out for sale in the free world."

Pryor, despite his conviction that the President is right in stepping up the pace of the war, is anything but a saber rattler. Returning here only long enough to make a private report to the Bureau of Narcotics, he is now off to the Holy Land in company with Bishop Walter Gray of the Connecticut Episcopal diocese.

"We will visit every spot in Jordan and Israel that was trod by the Prince of Peace," he says. Pryor and the bishop even have rare permission to pass both ways through the Mandelbaum Gate which separates the two warring nations.

The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy— Training School for Our Nation's Sea- going Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., which is located in the congressional district I have the honor to represent in this distinguished body, has been a steady source of stalwart men of the sea. That the Academy produces men is evidenced by the fact that three Kings Point alumni have been cited for bravery and outstanding service in Vietnam. I would like at this point to include in the Record a newspaper story about the most recent Kings Point graduate, Navy Comdr. Alexander C. Kuegler, Jr., and his service to our Nation:

THIRD KINGS POINT GRAD CITED AS VIETNAM HERO

Navy Comdr. Alexander C. Kuegler, Jr., of Sea Cliff is the latest of three graduates of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy in Kings Point to be cited for outstanding service in Vietnam.

Kuegler was recently awarded the Vietnamese Medal of Honor and the Navy Commendation Medal for bravery under gunfire while U.S. military adviser to the Commander, River Force.

CLASSMATES IN 1944

Previously, Lt. Comdr. Harvey E. Rodgers, of Smithtown, was awarded the Vietnamese Medal for Gallantry for his part in sinking a Vietcong armored vessel in Vung Ro Bay and Comdr. Paul C. Ewing, of McLean, Va., received the Navy Commendation Medal for establishing and operating a complex maritime advisory program.

Kuegler, a member with Ewing of the class of 1944, was cited for his service between July 4, 1963, and July 4, 1964, which "provided advisory assistance which proved combat readiness of Vietnamese Navy in support of counterinsurgency of effort against Vietcong."

Water Pollution in Michigan—A Way to Its Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to commend to my colleagues the very excellent speech delivered by our good friend JOHN DINGELL at the Clean Water Conference of the Michigan State Association of Supervisors on the subject of water pollution:

WATER POLLUTION IN MICHIGAN—A WAY TO ITS SOLUTION

(Address of Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, 16th Congressional District of Michigan, to the Michigan State Association of Supervisors, on January 18, 1966, at their Clean Water Conference in Lansing, Mich.)

My dear friends, I want to express my gratitude to you for the privilege of being here today and for the opportunity of discussing one of the most pressing resource problems of our day. I want to commend both my valued friend, Ed Connor, one of our outstanding public officials, for his expression of confidence in me, and the association for its interest in this desperate problem of water pollution.

The title assigned to me was, "Water Pollution in Michigan." I would like to take the liberty of adding to that title the words, "A Way to Its Solution." Briefly that solution is Federal, State, and local cooperation, large expenditures of funds, and vigorous enforcement of our antipollution laws.

Before I observe any of you going to sleep, I want to make it very clear that it is not my purpose to commence a doleful recitation of contamination of our State's once pristine waters. Nor do I intend to descend to a lugubrious recital of the effects of this contamination on health, welfare, and recreational opportunities of our people. Neither will I go into its devastating effects upon fish and wildlife and on the attracting of new industry to our State.

Certain of my comments will necessarily touch on these matters but only as incidental to a calm discussion of our water problems.

Michigan, like all other States, has been a bit like the farmer who was approached by the county agent and offered new advice on the latest and best ways to farm. The farmer replied, "Thank you very much for your help, but I am not farming right now as well as I know how." I say this with due deference to Mr. Loring F. Oeming, the executive secretary, and to the other members of our Michigan Water Resources Commission, who over the years have done one of the best jobs in the United States of managing water resources.

I can well recall that for a long time I used to receive a visit during just about every Congress from either Milt Adams, former executive secretary of the Michigan Water Resources Commission, or from our able assistant attorney general, Nick Olds, two of my very dear friends. Both of these men are among the most able officials and public-interest oriented individuals anywhere, and I think that all three of us looked forward to these visits. They initiated a regular tilt dealing with legislation sponsored by me which each of these good gentlemen sincerely felt would put our State agencies out of business, a calamity desired by none of us.

Our contacts started back in 1956 when Congressman JOHN BLATNIK first began the fight for meaningful water pollution control with the introduction of what was to become Public Law 660, the fundamental Federal water pollution law. This was enacted after the opposition of the States, some communities, and most industries, as well as the dedicated opposition of the Eisenhower administration, was overcome. All of the opponents of this legislation; industrial groups, State agencies, and the administration, stressed what to them were valid reasons for opposition. Industry pleaded the problems of compliance and cost increase; State agencies feared that the proposed legislation impinged upon their treasured jurisdiction; and the Eisenhower administration argued that "water pollution was a uniquely local blight," and of course worried that the legislation would provide \$50 million a year to assist communities in construction of desperately needed sewage abatement works.

Ultimately the differences with the State administrators were resolved by limiting the Federal activity to areas of pollution originating in one State and affecting health, life, and welfare in other States. The objections of the polluters and of the executive branch were simply battered aside, or compromises were made which resulted in garnering of a vote here or there, sufficient unto the need for passage of the legislation.

To their great credit, the Michigan Water Resources Commission, and my old friend, Milt Adams, recognized the wisdom of that legislation and fought valiantly for it at the end.

I saw my two beloved friends at the time I introduced a draft of the bill permitting communities to request the assistance of the Federal Government in the abatement of pollution coming from their upstream neighbors. This bill was changed to provide that the Governor of the State could request the Public Health Service to commence proceedings for the abatement of intrastate pollution. It then became law and was supported by my two friends and Michigan's State agencies. Parenthetically, it was this legislation which was utilized to initiate the Federal cleanup now taking place on the Detroit River at the request of former Governor Swainson.

I was again visited by my two old friends when I introduced legislation to establish Federal standards for the abatement of pollution of interstate and navigable waters and to establish a Federal agency to handle pollution of our waters.

It has been a remarkable experience to me to observe the continuing opposition of

Dan Jessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the American Football Coaches Association recently installed Daniel Jessee to be its new president, the first Connecticut and small college coach to be given this honor. I have spoken earlier of the career which brought him to this peak. I was privileged to be present at a reception held by his fellow small college and high school coaches of Connecticut, and I insert an account of that fellowship and comradeship at the meeting which was held here in Washington to be added to the RECORD.

This account is written by Bill Garrett of the Gannett News Bureau, and demonstrates the warm friendship which all in Connecticut feel for Dan Jessee:

TRINITY'S MR. JESSEE GOES TO WASHINGTON
(By William A. Garrett)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Every Nutmegger with a warm spot for football—from the Governor on down—told Dan Jessee last night how fortunate Trinity College and Connecticut were that he elected to go East rather than stay West years ago.

The Trinity coach—formally Prof. Daniel Jessee—received the accolade on the eve of his installation as president of the American Football Coaches Association, at a reception put on by Connecticut college and high school coaches.

This noon Jessee and some colleagues were to lunch with President Johnson at the White House.

It was Gov. John N. Dempsey who pointed up in a citation presented to Jessee by Don Russell of Wesleyan the good fortune that accrued to Connecticut when Jessee left the Pacific coast, where he already had demonstrated his prowess as athlete and mentor.

Looking on were scores of football's finest, from admiring State colleagues to national figures such as Syracuse's Ben Schwartzwalder, Penn State's Rip Engle, Otto Graham of Coast Guard, Army's Paul Dietzel and Eddie Enos of Montreal Loyola, a University of Connecticut product.

Representative EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Democrat of Hartford, a Little All-America back at Wesleyan, added to the applause. Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat of Hartford, had commended Jessee earlier. Joe Fontana of Southington, who chaired the event, lauded Jessee as one of sports' "most fierce competitors."

Jessee will be AFCA's first Connecticut and small college president. Dempsey cited the coach's record of 144 victories to 74 defeats and 7 ties, and his 4 perfect seasons.

The Governor saluted Jessee as "a man wholly dedicated to the well-being and betterment of intercollegiate sports." Karl Kurth, Trinity line coach who is to succeed Ray Oosting as athletic director at the college, introduced Oosting at a brief ceremony. Jessee's wife, Charlotta, also was acclaimed for her contribution to the coach's achievements.

Weaver High's Edward T. Knurek presented matched luggage to Jessee. There also were comments from Trinity Dean Bob Vogel, Fred Tonzel, of New York, called the college's most loyal fan, and George Ferris, its most loyal alumnus.

Also there were Wesleyan's Norm Daniels, Hugh McCurdy, its athletic director, and

Waino Fillback, of Middletown High. Jesse Dow represented southern Connecticut, and Bill Moore and Bill Lolka were from central Connecticut. Tom Kelly, of Manchester, was among the football editors on hand, and Tom Monahan, athletic director at Bristol, and Connecticut's Bob Engels were among other well-wishers.

Fern Tetreau, of Fairfield, spoke for the Connecticut Football Coaches Association, which he heads. Connecticut's J. Orleans Christian, newly inducted into the College Baseball Hall of Fame, shared the throng's congratulations. "I'm pretty proud," said Christian—of both his and Jessee's honors.

Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State Call for Positive Democratic Leadership in the New York State Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Harold R. Moskovit, president of the Affiliated Young Democrats, made the following announcement:

The State legislative committee of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York, at a meeting held on January 8, 1966, at the Hotel Ploccadilly in New York City, called for active and positive leadership of Democrats in the assembly and State senate with full responsibility to all the people of the State to assure reelection in 1966.

The organization expects its legislative program for 1966 to be introduced in the State legislature by their 22 members in the State senate of which the chairman is Senator Samuel L. Greenberg, of Brooklyn, and their 47 members in the assembly, of which the chairman is Assemblyman Daniel M. Kelly, of New York County.

Their legislative program follows:

We demand a bipartisan committee in State and New York City to set up a long-range tax program for 25 years and not the yearly rush for expediency.

We urge the legislators to support the following program which we consider important to the welfare of the people of this State and pledge ourselves to devote every effort to the enactment thereof; to wit:

"Raise drinking age to 21 years; primary election for all State officers; adopt new code of New York City Air Pollution Control Board for cleaner air; more housing; permanent personal registration be made statewide, with two changes, (1) must vote at two consecutive national elections and (2) do not have to reregister if voter moves within same county; vote at 18 years; stop turnstile justice by recodifying the statutes as they relate to juveniles, with uniformity of Federal and State laws; more vocational camps, rehabilitation and training centers, 2 voting days for national elections, first Mondays and Tuesdays in November; more State aid to education; extend ban on racial discrimination in housing; protection against slum landlords; create more judge-ships; legalize off-track betting by referendum; raise minimum wage to \$1.50 an hour; mandatory free tuition at all State and city universities and all community colleges; outlaw boxing; permanent spring primary

election day in June; stronger code of ethics; presidential preference primaries; legislature to at last ratify the 15th amendment; preserve our great natural resources; program to discourage dropouts in schools; State aid to public museums; create statewide recreation department; bonus for Korean veterans; increase teachers salaries; more and better aid to the aged and mentally ill; 3-day-weekend plan to celebrate all holidays, except religious holidays; help migrant workers; stronger law against dope peddlers; and finally, that a printed verbatim record of all the proceedings of the State legislature be made, and be made available to the public."

Diseases Aren't Cured by Treating Symptoms—A Responsible Student Speaks Out on Vietnam War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, amid all the dissensions and the violence on our campuses today, unfortunately the voice of the dissenter gets the most publicity. The voice of the fairminded, intelligent, and responsible student is seldom seen on TV or printed in the newspapers.

This article written by Richard Russell, a student in his junior year at Wisconsin State University—Eau Claire, and appearing in the Spectator, the student newspaper is one of the best appraisals of the Vietnam war that I have yet seen.

I recommend this article to my colleagues:

DISEASES AREN'T CURED BY TREATING SYMPTOMS

(ABOUT THE AUTHOR.—A 2½-year veteran of the Spectator staff, Richard Russell has closely pursued the development of the Vietnam war through extensive daily reading.

"America can't keep playing diplomacy to please countries like the Upper Volta Republic. It's about time our Government realized that, if we don't act in our own self-interest, no one else will do it for us," Russell says.

(Russell's article is the first on "The Soapbox," a page of opinion and depth reporting which will be featured throughout the year.)

(By Richard Russell)

Take an area of 40 million people and 284,000 square miles (about the same as Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky). Give it a steady temperature of 70-plus degrees and a summer rainy season which yields 80 inches of precipitation annually (much like southern Florida). Run a mountain range of 9,000 feet (like Oregon's Cascades) through the middle of it, and cover the rest with densely overgrown swamp-land (like Louisiana's).

Attack the inhabitants with 200,000 native guerrillas and respond with 200,000 foreign mercenaries. You now have a recipe for war in Indochina.

The people of the peninsula are largely a mixture of the Indonesians of the south and the Chinese of the north—whence the Indochinese. They had a flourishing civilization of their own between 500 and 1750 A.D. The Khmers, as they then called themselves, had their capital and chief religious center in the city of Angkor. The recently discovered ruins of the Angkor Wat (temple) indicate a high level of architectural development.

February 7, 1966

But buddhism and inner political conflict combined to destroy the Khmers, and the region underwent a period of regression until reawakened by French colonial forces. Between 1859 and 1893, France occupied the splinter states of Cambodia, Laos, Cochinchina, Annam, and Tonkin. Cochinchina was made a colony; the rest were protectorates.

France improved the region somewhat, with roads, harbors, and commerce, but kept a firm hand on the controls of government. The native rulers were allowed to continue, but they had only nominal power. France operated Indochina as a monopoly.

There was considerable resentment built up against this attitude of the French by the time World War II started. When Vichy France ceded control of Indochina to the tyrannical Japanese, resentment continued to mount. After Japan had lost the war, France had difficulty reasserting its territorial claim because of increasing pressure from Indochinese nationalists.

THE RED MENACE

Now, for a moment, let us look at another time and another place. Back in 1917, while Germany was at war with the world, a revolution broke out in Russia against the oppressive regime of Czar Nicholas II. Nicholas was defeated, deposed, and later killed. A democratic government lasted only a few months before Bolsheviks led by Nikolai Lenin and Leon Trotsky overthrew it for their own Communist regime.

The Communists also gained control of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Mongolia, and parts of Finland and Japan. World War II presented them with an opportunity to seize Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, East Germany, and East Austria.

In 1947 they saw another opportunity. The world was weary of war, and dismissed and rebellion in China as insignificant. It was really a Communist invasion. In 2 years, Red leader Mao Tse-tung had driven the nationalist forces of Chiang Kai-shek onto the island of Taiwan, thus bringing into the Communist fold the most populous nation on earth.

In later years, the world has seen communism expand into North Korea, Tibet, East Congo, and Cuba, with influence in Egypt, Algeria, Guinea, Indonesia, and any number of South American nations.

HO STRIKES

In all their gains, the Communists never once won a democratic election. Their only loss was East Austria, when that nation was neutralized. Yugoslavia, although pursuing its own course under Josef Tito, remains firmly Communist.

Returning to the Indochina of 1947, we find that France had granted greater autonomy to Cambodia and Laos. Cochinchina, Annam, and Tonkin had been combined into the single country of Vietnam. All three nations were undergoing very gradual emancipation.

But some Indochinese could not wait. Nationalist forces demanded immediate sovereignty. Rebellions flared. The French Foreign Legion busied itself with brush fire wars.

During this period, the expansionist Mao met Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh, a leader who, like Mao himself, was a self-made man of great personal appeal and considerable military ability. With Mao's support, Ho organized the immodestly named Vietminh, masqueraded as a nationalist to solicit support, and launched a vicious guerrilla war against French rule in Indochina.

As this war drew international attention, U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles recognized the scope of the problem: "The propagandists of Red China and Russia make it apparent that their purpose is to dominate all of southeast Asia * * * the so-

called rice bowl which helps to feed the densely populated region that extends from India to Japan. It is rich in many raw materials, such as tin, oil, rubber, and iron ore."

Unfortunately for the French colonial forces, they placed too many eggs in one basket. When that basket—the heavily fortified bastion at Dienbienphu—was crushed by the Vietminh on May 7, 1954, the end was in sight.

By an agreement of the major powers at Geneva, July 21, 1954, independence from France was granted to Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam, and the latter was partitioned along the 17th parallel. The northern zone, capitated at Hanoi, went to Ho. The south had a West-oriented native government. A plebiscite was to be held in both zones in July 1956 to determine if the country should be reunified. However, Red-hating South Vietnamese Premier Ngo Dinh Diem flatly refused to believe that the Communists would permit a free vote. In July 1955 he virtually eliminated any chance of holding elections, and the country has been divided ever since.

THE WADING GAME

To prevent further Communist incursions into southeast Asia, the United States has joined in defensive alliances with Japan, Australia, the Philippine Republic, New Zealand, Great Britain, France, Pakistan, and Thailand. This has not prevented the Pathet Lao from taking over half of Laos and forcing the rest to be neutralized. It has not prevented wavering toward communism by Cambodia's Prince Norodom Sihanouk. It has not prevented the Vietcong from wreaking destructions over all of South Vietnam.

The United States has 200,000 troops in Vietnam, and will double that number by year's end. It has the 7th Fleet and heavy air support. It has the aid of the South Vietnamese Government. Yet it has not stopped the Vietcong.

When the Cong is exhausted, it slips back into the rain forest. When it is defeated, it recruits in North Vietnam. When it is hungry, it terrorizes villages. When it is ill-equipped, it ships in supplies along the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

Who remembers the strategic hamlet? Last year, the United States reverted to the medieval system of fortifying hamlets, sending the villagers out to work by day, and locking them behind barbed wire at night. Horrified French officials pointed out that Dienbienphu was no more than a large "strategic hamlet." After losing several villages, the United States conceded.

Who remembers the "advisers"? This was America's title for the 40,000 troops it had stationed in Vietnam before 1965. They are now combatants.

Who remembers the American promise not to bomb in Laos? South Vietnamese Premier Nguyen Cao Ky revealed recently that the United States has been doing so for over a year.

All these incidents are indications that the war is escalating. The United States is committed now to war, and war it must fight to the logical end. But, as any physician will testify, in fighting a disease, one does not treat the symptom; one treats the cause. We must circumvent the symptom—the Vietcong—and strike directly at the cause—Red China. And we must not stop until the disease is totally exterminated.

"War is hell," remarked Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, and Benjamin Franklin agreed, "There never was a good war or a bad peace."

Then why are wars fought? In naming Gen. William Westmoreland "Man of the Year," Time quoted Winston Churchill: "Nothing is worse than war? Dishonor is worse than war. Slavery is worse than war. Churchill's was the view of the moralist.

A more expedient comment was that of Adolf Hitler: "The victor will not be asked afterward whether he told the truth or not. In starting and waging a war it is not right that matters but victory." Hitler's goal—you will recall, was lebensraum—living space—for his supposedly master race.

CHINA CHOKES

Germany could not possibly have needed lebensraum in 1933 as badly as Red China needs it now. A land choked with three-quarters of a billion people, China has run out of room, food, and time. There is no place to go but south. The Russian tundra to the north is as uninviting as the Himalayan Mountains to the west. Japan, Taiwan, and India are already crowded and facing problems of their own. China must look to the south.

If Vietnam falls, communism will have taken one more step toward its goal of world domination. As mentioned earlier, only East Austria has even been reclaimed from the Reds. In all other disputes, the Communists have won, not by elections but by subterfuge or by force. As J. Edgar Hoover remarks in "Masters of Deceit," [Lenin] held that here could be no permanent coexistence between Communists and non-Communists. The latter must be liquidated, by force if necessary."

This is especially true of China, which is pressed by a severe food shortage, while the Indochinese countries are so well supplied with rice that they export it. Mere lives mean nothing to Red China, which has seen great purges, widespread epidemics, and countless starvation. In fact, a war would serve to cut down on the burgeoning Chinese population. It would also provide the government with an explanation of the food, medicine, and housing shortage. Quite literally, the Chinese have nothing to lose by going to war.

With the United States pushing up from the south and Red China pushing down from the north, a conflict is inevitable. The big problem of the Chinese is time. Right now they could fight a war but could not win one. They must limit their actions to so-called conventional warfare, fought by proxy in Vietnam.

But their day is coming. Not until late in the presidential campaign of 1960 did Candidate John F. Kennedy mention, even briefly, the possibility that Red China might have an atomic bomb in the works. Up to that time, their sole nuclear capacity had been a small, tame reactor given them by the Russians in 1958. Yet, on October 17, 1964, Red China exploded a small atomic bomb at Lop Nor in Sinkiang Province.

Current predictions are that the Red Chinese will have a stock of nuclear weapons and that the primitive capacity to deliver them to American shores by 1972. The worst part of it is explained by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp in his Life article, "The Nuclear Power of China": "China can, in a very few years, become the most dangerous nuclear power of all * * * because they do not seem to understand nuclear war and therefore may not be rationally deterred from starting one."

He lists three facts which delude China into believing it would survive a nuclear war. First, they have more people; thus more would survive. Second, only one Chinese in seven lives in the relatively vulnerable cities; hence the population is harder to hit. Third, because of the backward industrial and transport facilities in China, there is less to rebuild.

Dr. Lapp continues to show that such survival would in fact be almost impossible: "The Strategic Air Command has hundreds of B-52 bombers, each of which can carry two 25-megaton bombs in its belly—the equivalent of 50 million tons of TNT * * *. A single 25-megaton bomb is a fearful instrument of destruction. It is 1,250 times more power-

ful than the bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima. The blast wave from one such bomb would destroy almost all Chinese housing over an area of 250 square miles. Within this area fatalities would be 80 percent * * *. The fallout from a single 25-megaton bomb can coat 15,000 square miles with a residue of lethal radioactivity * * *. We can conclude that almost half a billion people would die, immediately or in a few weeks, because of a bomber strike of 400 25-megaton bombs."

He goes on to say that the bombers are being phased out of the American defense setup in favor of missiles. But the missiles, because they must be relatively light to conserve on fuel, have warheads of only one megaton. By 1972, this will be our sole retaliatory defense. A missile attack on China would barely achieve a fifth of the results of a bomber strike.

Furthermore, the Chinese army and navy are now limited in their mobility. This will not be the case by 1972, given 5 years of wartime crash production of airplanes, weapons, and missiles.

It is unfortunate that few people can bring themselves to believe that China fully intends war. Eugene Burdick and William Lederer have taken extensive stock of Far Eastern communism. In "The Ugly American" they show U.S. Ambassador to Sarkhan, Gilbert MacWhite, as a well-meaning diplomat. He is shocked to discover that his trusted houseboy knows English and has been relaying secret information to the Communists. MacWhite concluded: "There was a strain of coldness, an element of finality, about the whole thing he had never encountered before. Politics in Asia were played for total stakes."

Total stakes. America cannot play for less. Nicolo Machiavelli summed up the alternatives: "There are two ways of contesting, the one by the law, the other by force, but because the first is frequently not sufficient, it is necessary to have recourse to the second."

STRIKE FIRST, PAY LATER

There are 14 cities in Communist China with a population over a million. They are also centers of production and transportation. If the United States attacks these cities now, it can, with a minimum of loss, cripple China's war capabilities. A few extra bombs could take out of commission the troop centers, the uranium plant, and the navy yards.

But the United States has always pledged not to strike first. Machiavelli had the answer to that, too: "A wise lord cannot, nor ought he to, keep faith when such observance may be turned against him, and when the reasons that caused him to pledge it exist no longer. If men were entirely good, this precept would not hold, but because they are bad, [a prince is] not bound to observe them."

To satisfy the queasy, we may borrow a page from the technique book of Adolf Hitler. Before attacking Poland in 1939, German troops captured their own radio station at Gleiwitz, broadcast a message in Polish announcing a Polish attack, shot a few Polish prisoners dressed as German soldiers, and left. If the thought of Poland attacking German weren't so laughable, the trick might have succeeded. It wasn't until after the war that solid evidence of the German deception was discovered.

No such ludicrousity exists in the Far East. A highly plausible attack on Quemoy or Taiwan could reopen a war which has never been formally ended. The United States could fake such an attack for public consumption, then jump in with all its horses as a Nationalist ally. Red China would fall, and Nationalist China could reclaim the mainland.

This picture is greatly simplified, of course. Nearly every war in history started out as a short war. The Chinese people

have been brainwashed to expect an American attack. They are trained to hate America and Americans, to give no ground to the foreign aggressors, to fight with any weapon available. They will try to fight a long war.

To counter this tendency, the United States could use chemical warfare. China is served by three great river systems—the Hwang Ho, the Yangtze, and the Si complexes. A fear-inducing drug dropped into the headwaters of these rivers would enable allied troops working downstream to take control gradually, before cowering natives could respond. But not that the headwaters are on the Russian border. For a completely successful operation, America will need Russian cooperation.

RUSSIA NEEDS US

This is not nearly as farfetched as it seems. Since the Sino-Soviet split of 1963, the Soviet Union has become increasingly aware that southeast Asia cannot possibly hold all the answers to China's long-range food problem. Sooner or later, China will demand Russian territory. And when it does, it will have nuclear incentives.

The U.S.S.R. is aware, too, that the United States is primed to strike at Russia in the event of enemy attack. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has said that both Russia and Red China can be completely obliterated, even if the United States is hit first. The Russians cannot afford to side with the war-hungry Chinese. They must then side with the only possible alternative—the United States.

After the war, probably another cold war will begin between the two great powers. But neither side will be fanatic about it. As a commercial rivalry, such a cold war might even be beneficial to the rest of the world.

We have seen that communism, stopping at nothing, has conquered half the world's population and a quarter of its surface area. We have seen evidence in Vietnam that China must go to war to feed its people and that they feel they have less to lose in a war. We have seen further how the United States and Russia are capable of stopping China if they strike in the next 5 years.

The American populace will rally behind its leaders if war comes, as it did in both World Wars and in the Cuban confrontation. And the leaders must also now realize that war is inevitable. As America abandoned its policy of neutralism to fight in World War II, so it will abandon its policy of non-aggression in world war III.

The question is not a question of war, it is a question of when. Let us hope the answer does not come too late.

"Tiger" Teague's New G.I. Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under the able, dynamic leadership of "Tiger" TEAGUE, chairman of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the House of Representatives today passed another historic milestone in veterans legislation. It is an outstanding tribute to Mr. TEAGUE that the House accepted his bill by the unanimous vote of 381 to 0.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Washington Post this morning. I thank the Post and commend this excellent editorial to the at-

tention of our colleagues and to the people of our country.

A NEW GI BILL

With the United States heavily committed to the war in Vietnam for the indefinite future there is a good deal of sentiment throughout the country for reestablishing a program of benefits for veterans. The House of Representatives is to consider a bill today sponsored by Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE that would provide assistance for this group in several useful categories including education, job counseling and loans on homes.

Representative TEAGUE is wisely bringing the bill up in a manner that will preclude amendments that could sharply increase its cost. The level of spending his bill calls for, \$330 million the first year and around \$500 million each year thereafter, is considerably higher than an administration proposal but somewhat lower than a similar bill that passed the Senate last session. It seems to be a reasonable compromise between what the veterans' groups want and what the administration is willing to spend.

Famous New England Author-Critic To Be Honored by Fellow Craftsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that one of New England's most distinguished figures is to be honored by the creation of a memorial cultural center. The late Van Wyck Brooks, who died on May 2, 1963, made a lasting contribution to American literature. The New York Times carried a detailed report on the memorial plans:

LIBRARY TO HONOR VAN WYCK BROOKS—WING TO BE CULTURAL CENTER NEAR LATE AUTHOR'S HOME

BRIDGEWATER, CONN., December 29.—Some of the leading figures in American arts, letters and sciences have formed a sponsoring committee to help build "a smalltown cultural center" in memory of Van Wyck Brooks, the author-critic who died here on May 2, 1963.

The center will be constructed as a wing to the Burnham Public Library. It will cost about \$200,000 and will house a re-creation of Mr. Brooks' study, the furnishings from his nearby home and portions of his library, as well as works of the writers discussed in his five-volume history of American literature, "Makers and Finders."

The architectural firm of Moore & Hutchins has designed the wing with two purposes in mind: to work toward the cultural betterment of the area and to serve as an inspiration and model for other smalltown centers across the country, according to Wendell Davis, New York lawyer, who will serve as committee chairman.

CONTINUING ARTS PROGRAMS

The wing and its contents will be made available to students of American literature. It will contain a meeting room with furnishings and equipment necessary for a continuing program of cultural activities. The program will be developed by a special committee that includes Mrs. Frank Lappin, library president, Mrs. Van Wyck Brooks and G. Douglas Johnson, first selectman of Bridgewater.

The cultural activities will include lectures, seminars, films, recorded and live concerts, and art exhibitions. A part of the memorial wing is designed to increase the town's current library facilities for adult and children's reference studies.

A drive for funds is now underway and is expected to last about 6 months. Contributions are already being received by the Van Wyck Brooks Memorial in Bridgewater.

The committee of sponsors, who were all friends and associates of Mr. Brooks, are:

Elizabeth Ames, director of the Yaddo colony; Francis Biddle, former U.S. Attorney General; George Biddle, artist; Dr. Carl Binger, psychiatrist; Pearl S. Buck, author; Norman Cousins, editor; Malcolm Cowley, author; Maxwell Geismar, author; John Hersey, author; Matthew Josephson, author; and Archibald MacLeish, poet.

Also, Elliott Macrae, publisher; Fredric Marsh, actor; David McCord, author; Adm. Samuel Eliot Morison, historian; Lewis Mumford, author; George D. Pratt, Jr., agriculturalist; Senator ABRAHAM D. RIBICOFF; John Richardson lawyer; Carl Sandburg, poet; Robert Spiller, professor of English at the University of Pennsylvania; Louis Untermeyer, author; Mark Van Doren, author; Dr. Warren Weaver, foundation executive; Glenway Wescott, author, and John Hall Wheelock, poet.

Leave House Members' Terms at 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week I directed the attention of the Members to my personal disagreement with the President's proposal to extend terms of House Members to 4 years. It is with pleasure that I note that one of the outstanding independent publications in my district, the Chicago Heights Star, commented in very effective fashion on this issue in their February 3 issue:

AS WE SEE IT—SHOULD RETAIN 2-YEAR CONGRESSIONAL TERMS

President Lyndon B. Johnson's recommendation that U.S. Congressmen be elected to 4-year, instead of 2-year, terms deserves to be rejected out of hand. It would remove one of the firm checks from our cherished system of checks and balances.

Nobody will quarrel with the fact that political campaigning costs money, and Congressmen could effect a saving by seeking reelection quadrennially. But their pay is good—\$30,000 per year—and so are their allowances for help. Nor does campaigning in a relatively small congressional district involve expenses to compare with statewide or nationwide appeals for voter support.

Biennial election of Congressmen provides voters with the important chance to enunciate approval or disapproval of presidential programs during the so-called off-year balloting. It also provides the machinery for introducing fresh blood into the legislative stream at timely intervals. And, in some instances, it makes the office holder responsive to the wishes of his constituents on a more continuous basis than would be the case if the job were safe for 4 years.

Particularly disagreeable in Mr. Johnson's proposal was the suggestion that the 4-year terms for Congressmen coincide with presidential terms. Enough deadwood is swept into office now on the basis of presidential

landslides; with respect to Congress, off-year balloting offers a chance to remedy the mistakes. Even if 4-year terms were desirable—and they are not—it would be judicious to start them at midpoint in the presidential administrations.

General Gavin's Dienbienphu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the excellent column of Joseph Alsop concerning the recent opinions voiced by Gen. James Gavin on the tactical situation in Vietnam.

GENERAL GAVIN'S DIENBIENPHU

(By Joseph Alsop)

DA NANG.—If any place in Vietnam affords a decisive test of Gen. James Gavin's proposed war strategy of holding "enclaves on the coast," that place is surely this great Marine coastal base.

The results of the test suggest that General Gavin, like so many other people, would do well to come and have a prolonged look at the war before offering his advice about it. To see why this is so, you need only add up the requirements of the Gavin strategy here at Da Nang, which is by far the largest and the most important of the coastal enclaves now held by the Marines.

Two Marine regiments now garrison Da Nang. In the near future, however, the able and courageous Marine commander, Maj. Gen. Lewis Walt, plans to reduce the Da Nang garrison substantially, so that battalions can take part in forward operations against the enemy.

More Marine outfits can be released from static defense, mainly because of the cover provided by General Westmoreland's forward strategy. General Walt, who dislikes static defense as much as every other good soldier, is naturally eager to make a larger contribution to the forward strategy.

But suppose the cover of General Westmoreland's forward strategy is removed. Suppose that General Walt is asked to hold a mere coastal enclave centered on Da Nang. What then will be General Walt's requirements? As summarized by him, it can be authoritatively stated that the answer is as follows:

First, General Walt will need a Da Nang garrison of two Marine divisions instead of the present two regiments—or exactly three times as many troops.

Second, General Walt will need more artillery, including heavy artillery or continuous support from naval guns.

Third, General Walt will need U.S. Government backing in taking substantially heavier casualty rates than are now considered acceptable.

Superficially, this may seem paradoxical. But General Gavin cannot realize that his strategy would knock the vital South Vietnamese Army straight out of the war, for rather simple political reasons which must be examined in another report. That means leaving six American and South Korean divisions to face the enemy alone.

That also means surrendering all the rest of South Vietnam to the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, immediately after the

American retreat to General Gavin's coastal enclaves. And alas, this is no longer the simple guerrilla war that General Gavin evidently imagines it is.

The backbone of the enemy's power today, without which the guerrillas would soon collapse, is a large and formidable force of regular troops, both Vietcong and North Vietnamese. These regular troops are now contained, kept on the run, and constantly subjected to grave attrition by General Westmoreland's forward strategy. But they would be automatically liberated by a retreat into enclaves and a free gift of all the rest of South Vietnam to the enemy.

The units of North Vietnamese Regulars now in South Vietnam equal either four or five divisions. The regiments and battalions of the Vietcong "main forces" equal eight divisions-plus. In addition, there are 30 Vietcong provincial battalions which could soon be transformed into "main force" units if they had no further work in their provinces.

Add up these figures. If the forward strategy should be abandoned, the enemy would have available in South Vietnam alone an offensive strength equal to about 16 divisions. In these circumstances, moreover, all of South Vietnam except the enclaves could be rapidly organized for supply purposes. And heavy artillery and five or six additional divisions could be brought down from North Vietnam. It would then be 6 divisions on our side against up to 20 on the enemy's side.

Such would be the enemy's resources for besieging General Gavin's coastal enclaves—and no one familiar with the course of this war can doubt for an instant that the proposed enclaves would be under heavy, obstinate and bloody siege in a matter of a few weeks or months. General Walt's reported requirements of two full Marine divisions to hold the Da Nang enclaves was based, it is understood, on a projected siege by five enemy divisions.

The projection was conservative and so was the requirement. It is frightening to contemplate the defense requirement for a Saigon enclave, with its far more difficult geography. In short, General Gavin's proposal unfortunately turns out to be one of two things, both mighty unpleasant.

It is either a proposal to give most of the country to the enemy while putting in far more American troops than General Westmoreland has ever requested. Or it is a plan for a series of coastal Dienbienphus, mitigated only by the freedom to turn tail and flee by sea.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

February 7, 1966

This sounds simple enough. In an editorial entitled "Facts of Life," the Baltimore Sun praised President Johnson's message on foreign aid which declared that Uncle Sam will help those countries that can make use of such help to help themselves.

As the Sun points out:

There is no magical way to make the jump from impoverished, backward economies to industrial affluence.

President Johnson's recommendations for a 5-year economic aid authorization, for a splitting off of military aid, and for a total of \$3.39 billion "are soundly based," the editorial stated.

Because this is a subject of concern to us all at this time, I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I have referred inserted in the Record, where I feel sure it will be studied by many of my colleagues:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 3, 1966]

FACTS OF LIFE

President Johnson's message to Congress on foreign aid is a reminder of the facts of life today in the underdeveloped countries. Their populations are increasing too rapidly; their production of food, or their capacity to buy food in world markets, is not increasing rapidly enough. The United States will help them to bring these factors toward a workable balance, if they will show that they can make use of such help to help themselves.

The President's message made the point—so old fashioned that it often is overlooked in a sophisticated world—that "the essence of economic development is work—hard, unremitting, often thankless work." There is no magical way to make the jump from impoverished, backward economies to industrial affluence. He noted that the steps toward modernization must include a heavier investment of a country's own resources in improved farming methods, in school and hospital construction and in essential industry; land reform and tax revision; a realistic facing of the problems caused by the rapid increase in population; an economic climate that will attract foreign investment and will keep local money at home. To those who may resent such advice from such a wealthy nation, the President can point out that it is based on our own experience, and that many of the steps were difficult for us, too.

A major change in foreign-aid emphasis, as well as in procedure, thus is proposed by the President. It is time for such a change, and Mr. Johnson should be encouraged to carry it out. Continued American help to economic development programs is essential, in our own interest no less than that of others, but aid is wasted if the programs are set up on weak foundations. Within this framework, Mr. Johnson's recommendations for a 5-year economic aid authorization from Congress, for a splitting-off of military aid, and for a total of \$3.39 billion are soundly based.

USDA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of

the Members of the House of Representatives a fine editorial on the budget requests of the Department of Agriculture which appeared in the February 2 edition of the Burlington Hawkeye. I believe the author, Mr. John McCormally, has presented an excellent analysis of the relationship of agriculture to the Nation's economy and the contribution the Agriculture Department makes to all citizens in both urban and rural areas.

I also believe that the separation of nonagricultural items from the budget of the Department of Agriculture would contribute to better public support of our agriculture program and to a better understanding of the true scope of this effort. The article follows:

USDA

When the next year's agricultural department budget is announced, critics bemoan the billions being lavished on the farmers, or spent on misguided farm support programs.

Apologists always reply that the budget is misleading. That there are many things done in the name of agriculture which are for the benefit of the city man as much or more than for the farmer. Examples are the meat inspections programs to protect the housewife shopper, and those campgrounds in the national forests.

Extension Director Jim Hodges sends over a bulletin which makes even more graphically the point that the Agriculture Department's interests range far. It reports that Department entomologists have developed a new insect repellent for protection against both water and land leeches, those ugly little globs which attach themselves to the skin and suck out blood.

The new preparation, field tested in jungle areas of the Philippines, is especially designed for use by our troops in Vietnam. It really ought to be charged to the Defense Department budget. No one ever argues much about that.

False Witness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1966, I inserted into the Record an editorial from a Mississippi publication pointing out the injustices done to the city of Jackson, Miss., and its fine police department as a result of unproven charges of police brutality brought by racial agitators after the arrest of civil rights demonstrators last June in that city.

One might be led to believe that the feelings expressed in that editorial are held only by Mississippians and people of other Southern States. However, in the Sidney, Mont., Herald, on December 22, 1965, there appeared an editorial which brings out the fact that such actions are not restricted merely to the Southern States, and deems such charges a warning to every community in this land.

This interesting and thought-provoking article follows:

FALSE WITNESS

One of the disturbing signs of these times is the readiness of some supposedly intelligent and responsible persons to accept and publicize, without question, an accused lawbreaker's claim that he was abused by the police. Take the case in Jackson, Miss., last June, when several hundred persons were arrested while picketing the State legislature, for parading without permits and refusing to disperse when so ordered. Agents of the U.S. Justice Department, "civil rights" attorneys and representatives of national news media were on hand during arrest and confinement of the demonstrators. None of them reported any undue force used by police. But then a three-man committee from the National Council of Churches talked with demonstrator-prisoners for only 2 hours (by their own statements), and thereafter presented to a group of U.S. Congressmen their "official" report charging the Jackson police with "Hitlerite" tactics, including gassing and beating of prisoners, kicking pregnant women in the stomachs, forcing women to undress in front of policemen, denial of food and medical treatment, and other such atrocities.

Headlines of several prominent newspapers blared this "news," TV commentators on nationwide networks "sorrowfully" reported it, several Members of Congress from other regions deplored the "police state" situation in the South which it seemed to represent—all without checking or waiting for proper authorities to check the validity of those charges against the Jackson police. Meanwhile, the mayor of Jackson and Mississippi State officials were demanding a Federal investigation to clear up the matter.

That investigation was completed many weeks ago, and not one single charge against Jackson police has been filed by the Justice Department. But we haven't seen any banner headlines announcing their exoneration of the NCC group's accusations. We've heard no apologies or corrections from any of the commentators or Congressmen who propagated those false stories across the Nation. Nor have we seen any sign that those "clergymen" who made up the NCC committee have done anything to atone for bearing false witness against the policemen of that southern city.

There is a warning note in all this for every community in the land. While the Southern States and communities have been the main targets so far, false charges of police brutality are now being made in other areas, too. The FBI has investigated 1,787 such allegations this year. Only 13 were found to warrant indictments. It is understandable that an accused lawbreaker might in turn accuse the police of mistreating him. But when clergymen, newsmen, and public officials promote charges of police brutality without first making sure of the facts, there is reason for the rest of us to question either their intelligence or their motives.

Vietnam Views Expressed in Hawaii by Visiting Newspapermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, newspapermen, because of the very nature of their work, are an excellent source of information concerning the opinion of a nation on important issues.

February 7, 1966

turning in a superior performance in his post in the U.S. mission. He is a good right arm and I value his advice highly. It is also a personal pleasure to be associated with him in our work for peace here at the United Nations.

I also want to convey my cordial regards and respects to Mrs. McCain who has likewise been a great help to my wife and myself in our work here at the United Nations.
 ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG.

This telegram was read to all who were present. I am sure those of us who admire Admiral McCain, the greatest living expert on and exponent of sea power, will say amen to everything that Ambassador Goldberg has said about Admiral McCain and his charming wife.

Most Budget Growth Due to Nondefense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the budget for fiscal 1967, which President Johnson submitted to Congress January 24, calls for estimated total expenditures of \$112,847 million. This is an increase of \$36,308 million over the budget for fiscal 1960, just 7 years ago. Actual expenditures that year totaled \$76,539 million.

Some will say that the war in Vietnam and our other defense needs have justified these huge increases. It so happens, however, that only 41 percent of the increases have been due to our defense requirements. While defense spending increased by \$14,850 million since 1960, nondefense spending went up by \$21,458 million during the same period.

I would like to show what accounts for most of this drastic increase in nondefense spending.

The largest of these increases has been \$6,272 million for health, labor, and welfare. Economic opportunity programs account for \$1,600 million of the increase—these programs began in 1965—public assistance, not including medical care for the aged, increased by \$1,303 million; health services for the aged account for \$1,122 million of the increase—this program began in 1961—other health services and research increased by \$1,684 million; vocational rehabilitation, and so forth, by \$438 million; and school lunch, special milk, and food stamp programs by \$104 million.

Spending for space research and technology has increased by \$4,899 million, the largest part of this sum having been the \$3,487 million increase for manned space flight. Funds for scientific investigations in space went up by \$531 million, meteorology and other space applications by \$92 million, and money for other research, technology, and supporting operations by \$790 million.

Interest on the national debt has gone up by \$3,588 million since fiscal 1960.

Expenditures for education have increased by \$1,968 million, the greatest

portion of this having been the \$1,219 million increase for elementary and secondary education. Spending for science education and basic research increased by \$305 million, higher education funds were reduced by \$121 million, and other aids to education required \$567 million in additional money.

Expenditures for natural resources went up by \$1,305 million. Funds for forests, recreational resources, minerals, fish and wildlife, and so forth, were all increased, the largest increase having been \$819 million for land, water, and power resources.

Money spent for international affairs and finance has increased by \$1,113 million, the largest share of this having been due to increased outlays for economic and financial programs of \$692 million.

Spending for general government has gone up by \$1,049 million. This includes money for tax collection and central fiscal operations, property and records management, protective services and alien control, legislative and judicial functions, central personnel management, territories, and possessions, and so forth.

Commercial and transportation outlays are greater by \$709 million, which includes increases for aviation, water transportation, postal service, area and regional development (this program began in 1962), regulation of business, and highways.

While spending for agriculture and agricultural resources dropped by \$234 million, this was because an increase of \$619 million for farm income stabilization and other smaller increases were more than offset by reductions for rural electrification and telephone loans and farming and rural housing loans.

Our political and military leaders have warned us that the war in Vietnam may be a long and hard one. The huge sums that will be necessary for prosecuting this war to victory ought to be offset, as far as possible, by corresponding decreases in other areas of the budget. Much of the responsibility for many of the programs that have been increased over the years could be shifted to State and local governments and to private individuals and organizations. The programs could then be conducted at considerably less expense and would be of less interference to the war effort.

The piecharts which the executive branch prepares annually, with so many cents for this and so many cents for that, are pretty, but remember: Each of these slices of pie will cost a pretty penny. In fact, each penny in the charts represents well over a billion dollars.

Good Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the reverse Peace Corps pro-

posed by President Johnson, which would permit those from other lands to come here to teach their language and culture in American schools, makes good sense.

In the first place, America gained its strength by having many cultures on which to draw.

Our minds are sharpened when new approaches and new ideas are demonstrated. We can better understand our own country by knowing more about other lands. We can better understand our own language by studying other languages. We all know that the best teacher in Spanish, for example, is someone who is speaking in his or her native tongue.

This is not only a world of have and have-not nations, the New York Herald Tribune noted recently, "but a world of nations in which have and have-not people live."

It points out that a great value will come from "making the struggle to raise the living standards of the poor more than ever a cooperative international venture."

Knowing that many will find this of interest, I offer the editorial for publication in the RECORD:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Feb. 3, 1966]

THE REVERSE PEACE CORPS

The reverse Peace Corps proposed yesterday by President Johnson opens some interesting possibilities. He asks that 5,000 foreigners be brought to the United States to teach their language and culture in American schools, and to work in the antipoverty program here. The teaching is reminiscent of the promising cultural exchange proposals made by President Kennedy as part of his Alliance for Progress program; addition of the antipoverty work would emphasize that the struggle to improve the human condition is indeed worldwide.

It is true, certainly, that foreign nationals could find plenty of poverty to fight in their own countries. But techniques learned here would better equip them for the task, while many of them could bring insights that might be strange to the average comfortably situated American, and that would be highly useful in the poverty war.

The greatest value, however, might well be in a growing recognition that we are not merely a world of have and have-not nations, but a world of nations in which have and have-not people live, and in making the struggle to raise the living standards of the poor more than ever a cooperative international venture.

Foreign Aid—Help for Those Who Help Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, if Americans work hard to earn their dollars and pay their taxes, then we can ask of countries expecting our aid that they be willing to work hard in order to make good use of the aid.

Recently, a distinguished group of 17 newspapermen, representing such countries as Australia, South Vietnam, Okinawa, Malaysia, Republic of China, Japan and New Zealand, during a stopover in Hawaii gave what they believed were the views of their people concerning the conflict in Vietnam. Their frank appraisal of the situation ranged from a recently awakened interest by the people of Australia to one of alarm by the people of New Zealand. But, by and large, the general consensus was one of support of the U.S. position.

The group is visiting the United States at the invitation of our Government. Because we respect and value the views of the Asian and Pacific countries, and because the opinions of many of these nations are reflected in the opinions of the visiting newsmen, I commend for your reading the article which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser of Thursday, January 20, 1966:

ASIA, PACIFIC NEWSMEN BACK U.S. VIET POLICY

Asian and Pacific newspapermen visiting Honolulu yesterday expressed worry and regret over the war in Vietnam, but most said they thought U.S. intervention there was necessary for world peace.

Nghiem Xuan Thien, editor of Saigon's Thoi-Luan Daily News, said:

"The key to military success in my country is protection of the villages—because it is the villages that supply food to the Vietcong."

Thien is one of 17 newsmen from the Far East and the South Pacific who are looking at Hawaii this week before going to the Mainland at the invitation of the U.S. Government.

Thien, who fled Hanoi and the Communists in 1954, said:

"It would take millions of troops to protect the South Vietnam frontier. It would be impossible."

He said the United States is doing a good job protecting many of the villages. "U.S. protection of a village is like an oil spot—it spreads U.S. friendly influence."

Said J. Lloyd Marshall, feature writer for the Perth Daily News in western Australia:

"The penny has finally dropped in Australia."

"Twelve months ago there wasn't much awareness of the war. Now there is a keen awareness and the people realize that what they are really up against is Red China."

"We know that if South Vietnam is lost Red China will get her hands on the southeast Asia food bowl. Australia realizes that the Australian nation would then be at stake."

Morihide Tomikawa of the Okinawa Times political desk, said:

"The people of Okinawa are deeply concerned with the escalation of the Vietnamese war. We have had many, many demonstrations seeking peace."

Because of Okinawa's strategic position in the Pacific and past experiences with war "Okinawans always fear what will happen."

Chen Ken-sin, bureau chief of Sin Chew Jit Poh in Malaysia, said:

"Malaysia would be threatened if South Vietnam falls to the Communists. Our Prime Minister has stated time and again that he wants to see a peaceful settlement."

Albert H. Liu, reporter for Taipei's United Daily News, said the Republic of China is firmly behind the American intervention in Vietnam.

"Peace and security of southeast Asia can be won," he said. "Our Government hopes America continues her present policy in Vietnam."

Ikuo Kanmuri, editorial writer for Kyodo News Service in Tokyo, said:

"Japan is very worried over the war's escalation. Every day the press keeps saying that it hopes the war will not get bigger."

"Some people think the United States is to blame as much as the Communists."

Keith Eunson senior editorial writer of the Otago Daily Times in New Zealand, said:

"New Zealand considers the war with alarm. We back every peace proposal the United States had made."

"But what's the solution?"

Not In Vain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, it is to the President's everlasting credit that he gave Hanoi every opportunity possible to show some signs of willingness to negotiate before he ordered the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam.

The New York World Telegram of February 1, declared editorially:

Surely no nation in history in the midst of a war ever made so many conciliatory overtures to an enemy. And no enemy has been less provoked and more wrong, morally, in its aggression.

But in spite of the bombing resumption, as the World Telegram declared:

Still, Johnson is not giving up on the hope that talking is better than fighting. We have asked the United Nations Security Council to meet especially to deal with the Vietnam war.

I am much in agreement with this editorial when it states:

What the Security Council can do, or is willing to do, is a question. But the proposal shows how far this country has been willing to go in an effort to supplant the battle with debate at a conference table.

Perhaps the move to the United Nations Security Council is only a step in the direction of the conference table which may very well take place in Geneva. Speaking for myself and as the voice in the 89th Congress of the people in my district, I say, the sooner the better. The life which may be saved might be a loved one.

The World-Telegram's editorial is a resolute affirmation of this country's determination that the loss of American and allied lives shall not have been in vain. I am pleased to ask permission to have the editorial inserted in the Record.

[From the New York World-Telegram, Feb. 1, 1966]

THE BOMBING RESUMES

After 37 days of deliberate restraint, the United States—in agreement with the South Vietnamese—has resumed bombing military targets in Communist North Vietnam.

This is, quite plainly, a military necessity. Most Americans, in our judgment, would say it is about time. The risk of not trying to disrupt Communist supply sources, infiltration routes and other assets of the North Vietnam invaders are substantial from the standpoint of the safety of the allied forces in the south.

But the South Vietnamese and the United States took these risks to give the Communists every opportunity, beyond doubt, to

agree to something: a cease-fire, negotiations, a slowdown in the fighting.

President Johnson's statement yesterday summed up the situation exactly: We were urged to wait 10 to 20 days for a response from Hanoi. We waited 37 days and got nothing. Meanwhile, Communist violence against the South Vietnamese and our own forces went on, even during the one-sided new year truce.

The Vietnamese and our troops are anxious for peace, "but while there is no peace they are entitled to the full support of American strength and American determination."

Still, Johnson is not giving up on the hope that "talking is better than fighting." We have asked the United Nations Security Council to meet especially to deal with the Vietnam war.

What the Security Council can do, or is willing to do, is a question. But the proposal shows how far this country has been willing to go in an effort to supplant the battle with debate at a conference table.

Surely no nation in history in the midst of a war ever made so many conciliatory overtures to an enemy. And no enemy has been less provoked and more wrong, morally, in its aggression.

The bombing may not persuade Ho Chi Minh and his backers to come and talk. It will help take the heat off the troops in combat.

But since the Communists won't even give a civil answer to the overtures for negotiation, or to world opinion, the only choice is to try another proposition—military pressure.

Our only objective is "peace and freedom" in South Vietnam. If this is not possible by negotiation, we simply will have to achieve it the hard way, by force.

Mr. Speaker, we are the strongest and most powerful nation in the world. We have the equipment—the firepower, the ammunition—to exert the "military pressure" of which the editorial speaks, however, I am convinced that our President and the overwhelming majority of Americans want peace. That is why I believe that President Johnson will use this military power with restraint, with caution, with the reservation that having twice stopped the bombing, we may do so again when the talks begin.

On January 10, 1966, I suggested that we consider a blockade of the port of Haiphong. Today, February 7, 1966, in the light of events which have taken place in the space of only 28 days, I propose postponing consideration of that suggestion for the time being, so as not to hinder or frustrate our President's peace efforts.

I share the views of my constituents that every avenue and door to peace be kept open. This is the position of our President today and it will be to his everlasting credit if this continues to be his policy—so that his efforts to establish peace in the world shall not be in vain.

Plain Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in making it plain why the airstrikes over North

Vietnam were resumed, the New York Herald Tribune did a masterful job on February 1 when it stated that if Ho Chi Minh insists on war or surrender, he must have war.

"No American can feel happy at being presented with this choice," the newspaper stated, adding that since Hanoi made it so abundantly clear that it was rejecting all overtures for peace talks we were left with no alternative.

The editorial stated:

Few Americans would want to endanger the lives of our men in Vietnam by a continued withholding of the means to strike at North Vietnamese supply routes, or allow Ho to work his wicked will from sanctuary.

This is an issue which concerns us day and night, and I commend the Herald Tribune for its concise, logical presentation of the facts. I believe many of my colleagues will want to see it, and I therefore offer it for the RECORD:

BOMBS AND RESOLUTIONS

In announcing the resumption of bombing attacks on North Vietnam, President Johnson made it plain that this was the result of the considered judgment of the responsible military and political agencies of the American Government. And that judgment can only be seriously contested on the assumption that the United States has no business in Vietnam at all.

For the bombing pause failed to produce any hint from Hanoi that it was willing to sit down at the conference table. It not only continued to insist on acceptance of its original four points (which would mean total victory for the Vietcong) but has added, as the British Foreign Office terms it, "a new and even more unacceptable prior condition"—recognition of the Vietcong as "the sole genuine representative of the people of South Vietnam."

Since Ho Chi Minh insists on war or surrender, he must have war. No American can feel happy at being presented with this choice. But since it has been made so abundantly clear by the rejection of President Johnson's peace overtures, few Americans would want to endanger the lives of their men in Vietnam by a continued withholding of the means to strike at North Vietnamese supply routes, or allow Ho to work his wicked will from sanctuary.

At the same time, the United States is fighting this war to end it, and the President has given renewed evidence of American determination in this respect by taking the case formally to the United Nations.

This has not been done before for several reasons. In the first place, the only international body which had been seized of the Vietnamese dispute was the Geneva Conference of 1954. That body could be recalled to discuss the problem; the British Government, as one cochairman, has been trying to do so. The Soviet Union, the other co-chairman, has refused.

There is also the fact that neither North Vietnam nor Red China, the power prodding Ho Chi Minh toward continued war, is a member of the U.N., and both have repeatedly and explicitly denied that the U.N. has any role to play in their affairs.

The American resolution, however, does not set forth specific terms for a settlement, or even outline fixed steps toward a settlement—which would almost certainly have brought immediate rejection by Hanoi. Rather, the American proposal would place the Security Council officially in back of a general search for peace, such as the United States has already, informally, asked the U.N. to undertake. This would include a conference, with the objective of applying the Geneva accords of 1954 and 1962 (the latter concerned Laos) and of setting up and

supervising a cease-fire. Composition of the conference is not spelled out; the door remains open for mediation or arbitration, as suggested by Pope Paul.

The effect of such a resolution would bring pressure upon the Soviet Union to do what it has thus far refused to do—sponsor another session of the Geneva Conference. It would also, if adopted (or even if accepted by a majority and lost through a Soviet veto) furnish Security Council support for American peace efforts. And in any case, by accompanying the bombs with a resolution, President Johnson dramatizes anew the American position: to fight if necessary; to negotiate if possible.

Federal Funds Already Have Aided Many Persons in Volusia County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker I am proud to say that the great State of Florida is moving into the vanguard of those States making maximum use of provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, the war on poverty.

I am proud of the tremendous progress being made by the city of Tampa and Hillsborough County which comprise the congressional district which I have the privilege to represent in the House of Representatives. On our east coast, Volusia County is moving forward in several antipoverty programs. The Daytona Beach News-Journal, one of Florida's great newspapers, is running a series of articles dealing with that county's efforts in this battle.

The article follows:

FEDERAL FUNDS ALREADY HAVE AIDED MANY PERSONS IN VOLUSIA COUNTY

(By Ray LaPrise)

As Project Upgrade officials are struggling to get approval from the Office of Economic Opportunity, Atlanta, on their own application for working funds and the application from the West Volusia Council on Human Relations, some Federal money to fight poverty already has come into the county.

Volusia school officials got a \$71,988 grant last summer to operate Head Start. This is the project under which 526 5- and 6-year-olds from low-income families throughout the county got kindergarten instruction, medical care and nutritious lunches in 13 schools from June 8 to July 27.

As the program went on for tots, their parents also were invited to attend night meetings at the schools where qualified speakers lectured on such topics as legal aid and how to manage on low budgets.

The antipoverty program also has been felt through Neighborhood Youth Corps. John Shaw, manager of the local Florida State Employment Service, said his office was asked to recruit young people—mostly high school dropouts—by the Florida Park Service, Florida Forestry Service and Road Department.

Shaw, who also serves as chairman of Upgrade's committee on employment, job training and counseling, said 37 young people from this area were hired out of the 61 who applied for Neighborhood Youth Corps since last June.

As members of the Neighborhood Youth

Corps, they work 32 hours a week and spend another 2 hours a day studying. Among them are eight youths and one girl on duty at Tomoka State Park.

Financially handicapped students at Bethune-Cookman College here and at Stetson University, DeLand, have been enabled to continue their work because of what is called the work-study program.

Bethune-Cookman College got a grant of \$18,000 for the spring and summer semesters last year and another grant of \$90,000 for the fall 1965 semester and 1966 spring semester.

College officials distribute the money to students hired for such campus jobs as laboratory and library assistants and dormitory supervisors.

A number of Stetson students also benefited by work-study grants received by the university, including \$14,235 for last spring's semester, \$40,000, last summer and \$22,396 for the 1965 fall semester.

Upgrade's present officers are former Daytona Beach Commissioner Stanley Nass, president; Mrs. Glenn A. Bassett, Daytona Beach, secretary; Volusia School Superintendent John Smiley, vice president; and Volusia Juvenile Judge Robert L. Lee, treasurer.

Upgrade also has 11 committees, whose chairmen are:

Rev. Rogers P. Fair, resident participation, 15 members; Volusia Health Officer D. V. Galloway, health, 7 members; Florida State Employment Service Manager John Shaw, employment, job training, and counseling, 5 members; Juvenile Judge Lee, finance, 4 members; Dr. Harland Merriam, evaluation to programs, 5 members; County Commissioner Smith, governmental, 4 members; Mrs. Richard Fellows, welfare, 8 members; urban renewal relocation officer, James Daniels, housing and home management, 6 members; Julian Markham, education, 7 members; Rev. Lilburn Moseley, consumer education and information, 6 members; and Daytona Beach Attorney Leon van Wert, legal aid, 7 members.

Upgrade, until it gets money to rent its own office space, will go on filling out forms and storing its files in Van Wert's office at 136½ South Beach Street.

Public Land Treatment: Watershed Project Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed by the efforts being made in the State through local soil conservation districts to improve and make better use of our land and water resources. I am particularly interested in the work being done in local watershed projects to reduce flooding, protect lands and homes, and bring about a brighter economic future. I am concerned that this work move ahead as rapidly as possible. Serious flooding in 1962 and 1964 produced millions of dollars in damages in my State; we need to be better prepared in the future.

One problem in watershed progress is potentially of concern in many States where public and private lands are intermingled. In several cases, public land agency funds have been insufficient to meet land treatment needs; but projects

Buffalo's New Urban Renewal Commissioner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Buffalo faces all the challenges which other major U.S. metropolitan areas face: the decline of the central commercial core, blight in the gray areas, traffic congestion, a dwindling tax base, and so forth.

But I am happy to report the city of Buffalo, behind the leadership of Mayor Frank A. Sedita, is tackling these problems with new vigor and determination.

A keyman in this great undertaking is our new urban renewal commissioner, Richard L. Miller. I am proud to say that Mr. Miller is an old and close friend of mine. He played a key role in the conception and development of the Buffalo urban renewal program, and he comes to his new post with laurels won in pushing forward Buffalo's dynamic downtown renewal program.

Buffalo is on the move. And young men like 40-year-old Richard Miller are playing key roles. Under leave to extend my remarks, I here include an article from the Buffalo Courier-Express of January 25, which sets forth Mr. Miller's view of his new and challenging assignment:

MILLER TAKES STERN VIEW OF RENEWAL
(By Jim McAvey)
REALISTIC VISIONS

Buffalo's new \$17,500 a year urban renewal commissioner, Richard L. Miller, is no builder of castles in the sky.

He is a hardheaded pragmatist with visions of a more beautiful city. He believes these visions can be made realities only through the down-to-earth, patient expenditure of energy needed to sail programs over seas of redtape.

"We are going to have to combine our aspirations with realism," Miller said. "There is a lot of redtape to go through and it takes time."

Just turned 40, the fair-skinned, 6-foot, 200-pound commissioner looks askance on "miracle working" urban renewal schemes.

OBJECTIVE: CONFIDENCE

"I think Buffalo can be made a greater city, but this job is only part of it," he said. "Urban renewal can only provide the physical setting for living. There are other aspects—economic, political, social, cultural."

A native of Buffalo, the blue-eyed Miller has a full head of blond hair that sweeps straight back from a high forehead. He has the broad shoulders and coordinated movements of the athlete he was.

He gives the impression of being intensely sincere about the job he is undertaking.

"I'm not starting anything," Miller said. "This is a continuing program that has to grow. We have to develop a sound and expanding program, one that will gain the confidence of the people of Buffalo and of the Federal Government, which provides most of the money."

Miller believes most people have a feeling the Federal Government runs the whole urban renewal program.

"Actually," he said, "the responsibility is on the city. We have to merit continued Federal support or the Federal Government can put the brake on. Our local performance is what counts."

WELL PRIMED

Miller said he is depending on men who have been working in the urban renewal department to brief him on the status of programs. There are 66 employees in the department.

But he gave much evidence of having detailed knowledge of the programs.

He said his work as executive director and secretary of the Greater Buffalo Development Foundation had much to do with his views on urban renewal. He was executive director of the foundation from May 1958 until he took over his present job January 1.

The foundation played a vital role in the planning and promotion of the downtown renewal project. Miller sees the downtown project as an excellent example of what can be brought about without Government funds.

CODES, INCENTIVES

"Downtown is showing what we can do on our own," he said. "Part of the deal is for people in official capacities to encourage people to do something about their environment."

Miller does not believe that rehabilitation of dilapidated houses and neighborhoods, "just happens," or that enforcement of housing codes is, of itself, enough.

"People have to be convinced that something good is going to come from their efforts to improve their properties," Miller said. "We must give people incentives, through public actions, to upgrade their properties far beyond minimum standards required by the code."

FAMILY MAN

A 1949 Dartmouth graduate who served in the Navy in World War II and the Korean war, Miller started out to be a newspaperman. He was a reporter for the Buffalo Evening News in 1951 and again from 1953 to 1958.

He smokes a pack a day, golfs, bowls, reads, and spends a lot of time "amusing my four kids."

He is married to the former Patrizia Nagy of Toledo, Ohio, a sculptress who has given him "a great deal of interest in the arts."

They live at 650 Lafayette Avenue.

Education Benefits for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, passage of H.R. 12410, the GI education bill, was not only morally right but economically sound for our Government.

To provide for the smooth and constructive return of our servicemen to civilian life is just as essential as it is to prepare him with needed training and equipment to enable him to do a proper job in the Armed Forces.

I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that this action will pay similar dividends to those realized from the investment in education for veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. I am sure this assistance will account for an increase in our

gross national product as did the investment in the education of veterans of World War II and Korea.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this legislation was long overdue.

America Understands 

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, with the resumption of bombing of North Vietnam there has risen considerable controversy in the American press concerning the bombing and the intensified peace efforts that preceded it and are continuing.

Extensive coverage has been given to a very vocal minority that opposes our efforts to maintain the freedom of the Vietnamese with the result that it is, at times, difficult to determine how the average American views these activities. However, a recent editorial, which appeared on February 2, 1966, in the Beaumont Enterprise, an outstanding newspaper published in southeast Texas, states succinctly the feelings of an overwhelming majority of our citizens who support the President and who understand and are aware of our responsibility and purpose in southeast Asia.

The text of the editorial follows:

A TEXAN DECIDES

In spite of our disappointment that the 37-day lull in the bombing of North Vietnam failed to bring peace talks, we feel that the long pause was on the whole a net gain for this country.

We have underscored our devotion to a peaceful settlement in Vietnam in a way that neither friend nor foe can misinterpret.

We have cut the ground from underneath the feet of those critics in Europe and Asia, who, for varying reasons, have tried to paint us in the colors of aggressors or new colonialists.

Our reconnaissance has been such that, now that the bombing is being resumed, we know where the enemy troop and supply buildups have taken place and we can hit those places quickly and in great force.

Thus, it seems to us that the pause did more good than harm.

Given the intransigence of Hanoi and Peking, the negative, churlish and unyielding attitude of the Communists, the President had no choice but to renew the bombing attacks on the enemy's staging grounds in North Vietnam.

Be it noted, also, that during the entire period of the bombing pause, there was never the slightest lull in the terrorist tactics of the Vietcong on the ground. Unharmful men, women, and children among civilian refugees were savagely slain, along with American and South Vietnamese soldiers.

We are glad that President Johnson made a new Vietnam peace bid, even as he ordered the bombers back into action. The two actions taken together would seem to indicate that we will, in the words of the late President Kennedy, "never negotiate from fear, but never fear to negotiate."

It is likely that hard decisions and harder days are ahead for President Johnson and all

February 7, 1966

Americans. But we can face them secure in the knowledge that we have done all that reasonable men can do to gain a just and honorable peace in southeast Asia.

Maritime Budget Is Inadequate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called to the attention of my colleagues in the House the plight of our merchant marine and expressed disappointment and concern over the cut in the 1967 budget funds for this important fourth arm of our country's defense. In this connection, I insert in the Record a statement by Mr. Joseph Curran, chairman of the AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, which follows:

"The budget request for the Maritime Administration this year is sadly inadequate. It reflects an adoption of the Interagency Maritime Task Force report. This report was rejected by the President's Maritime Advisory Committee. We also understand that this report is opposed by the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor.

Longstanding national policy provides that we shall have a merchant marine to carry a substantial portion of our waterborne import-export foreign commerce, and also capable of serving as a naval auxiliary in time of war or national emergency. To assure that our merchant marine would serve the Nation in this dual capacity, various aids such as the operating and construction subsidies are extended to qualified operators.

Because of the lack of Government leadership which reflects indifference and neglect in advancing this policy, our merchant marine has declined to where it carries less than 9 percent of our waterborne foreign commerce.

The Secretary of Commerce must have realized the cause of the declining fleet clearly when just recently he stated that he is opposed to building foreign and that the Government has not fulfilled its obligation in building a merchant marine.

In realization of the sad state of our merchant marine, the President established the Maritime Advisory Committee. At its first meeting, the Maritime Advisory Committee adopted a resolution endorsing our national maritime policy, as stated in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, as in the public interest. Following this, the Committee developed a program, the basic theme of which is the renewal and expansion of the American merchant marine.

At the time it became obvious that the Maritime Advisory Committee was going to come up with a program for developing a merchant marine, the Interagency Maritime Task Force was established to counter and add confusion to the MAC recommendations. To add to the confusion, the task force, which contains the Maritime Administrator's recommendations, has advocated less ships to carry less cargo and even these ships to be built principally in foreign yards.

This year's budget request of \$85 million for construction subsidies (\$47 million less than last year) provides for building only 11 ships. This is raised to 13 after some doubtful and very peculiar juggling of figures.

The operating-differential subsidy request is \$185 million (\$5 million less than last year).

Members of the House and Senate have expressed their disappointment of the budget request. Their course of action to correct the situation is not known at this time. Even if Congress should increase the inadequate budget request, as has been suggested, it is doubtful that the Administration would use the funds.

The Interagency Task Force report and this year's budget request highlights the fact that administrative dedication to our Nation's maritime policy is a prerequisite to the successful administration of our maritime laws. Currently, the Maritime Administration is set on a completely opposite course of action which would administer the merchant marine out of existence.

If this confusion and neglect is not corrected soon, there will be no merchant marine to transfer into the President's proposed Department of Transportation.

Foreign Markets for Poultry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the development of foreign trade in the poultry industry is most important for the continued growth of this vital industry in the United States, as well as the contribution it would make toward a more favorable balance-of-payments picture for our country.

I call to the attention of my colleagues a news release of the National Broiler Council, an organization dedicated to the growth, development, and improvement of the poultry industry. This news release, dated December 23, 1965, announced participation of Mr. G. Ted Cameron, president of the National Broiler Council, and Mr. Frank Frazier, executive vice president, in the U.S. Feed Grain Trade Exhibits and Seminar, scheduled to take place March 7 to 18, 1966, in Tokyo, Japan.

Participation in this project by the National Broiler Council I am sure will prove most valuable in the development of foreign markets for the poultry industry in the United States.

The article follows:

DECEMBER 23, 1965.

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The appearance of two American broiler industry leaders on the program of the U.S. Feed Grain Trade Exhibits and Seminar scheduled for next March 7-18 at the U.S. Trade Center in Tokyo, Japan was announced here this week by Clarence D. Palmby, executive vice president of the U.S. Feed Grains Council.

Palmby announced that G. Ted Cameron, president of Mountaire Poultry Co., Inc., North Little Rock, Ark., and Frank Frazier, executive vice president of the National Broiler Council, Washington, D.C., will be key participants during various segments of the entire seminar. Cameron is president of the National Broiler Council.

In making the announcement, Palmby pointed to the timely topics to be presented by each of the broiler industry men. "The realm of 'Practical Broiler Production in a Scientific Age' and 'The Broiler Business—Finance, Controls, and Marketing' constitute two papers bearing important messages to be given by Mr. Cameron. He is a true practitioner and exemplifies the executive who

heads the multiphased operation which comprises a modern broiler firm, and the Far East audience will be especially interested in what he has to say."

The Feed Grains Council executive emphasized that the topic Frazier will cover, "Consumer Information, Market Research, and Market Support Functions of a Commodity Organization," will not only benefit the sponsors of the trade show, but will strengthen market development programs in Japan.

"We were especially glad to receive the report that the Broiler Council's board of directors accepted our invitation extended to Frank Frazier," stated Palmby who is acting for the various groups cooperating with the Foreign Agricultural Service of USDA in making the arrangements for the Tokyo event. "We have observed the outstanding job that the National Broiler Council has done during the past several years, and consider it a classic example of intelligent self help in molding a production-oriented industry into a hard-hitting, market-oriented group using strong programs in merchandising, research, and consumer education—all to the benefit of both the industry and the general public," he added.

Palmby noted that the Feed Grains Council cooperates wherever possible on worthwhile projects that can be of value to groups promoting the export of agricultural products. "We feel the planned trade show, done in cooperation with the American Soybean Association, the National Renderers Association, the U.S. Agricultural Attaché's office in Japan, and the International Trade Fairs division of FAS to be one of these extremely worthwhile projects," he stated.

The announcement from the U.S. Feed Grains Council concluded noting the satisfaction and appreciation of the council's executive when he said, "Cameron and Frazier, along with the others who will make up the program, insure our efforts in making a positive contribution to our expanding dollar sales of an important, interrelated group of American agricultural products to Japan. We certainly are indebted to the National Broiler Council leadership for their cooperation."

Vice Adm. John S. McCain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, those of you who know and respect Vice Adm. John S. McCain will be as pleased as I to learn of the outstanding tribute paid to Admiral McCain by our United Nations Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg.

On January 29, the Old Guard of the city of New York honored Admiral and Mrs. McCain. Ambassador and Mrs. Goldberg were unable to attend the banquet but the Ambassador sent the following telegram to the Old Guard Commandant, Colonel Rizza:

I regret indeed that matters of state over which I have no control will prevent me from being with the Old Guard on Saturday evening, January 29, when you honor my friend and colleague, Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr. I am especially sorry I cannot be present because I have the highest regard for Admiral McCain. Please convey my regrets to the members of the Old Guard. I would like to tell you that Admiral McCain is

ployers for the year 1964 was 1.60 percent—the figure for 1965 is not available as of this date. "Agreed" legislation enacted in 1965 increased weekly benefits almost 20 percent, and made other improvements in the law.

Does this sound like the unemployment compensation programs of this Nation are outdated and the States are asleep as Rip Van Winkle in discharging their duty? Absolutely not.

The provision in H.R. 8282 which increases the taxable wage base from the \$3,000 per year to \$5,600 in 1967, and to \$6,600 in 1971 and thereafter is totally unnecessary to finance Federal and State costs of unemployment compensation programs.

On several occasions during the past 16 years, the Secretary of Labor has asked a Federal Advisory Council on Unemployment Compensation matters, composed of 34 members, and created by the Secretary of Labor in 1949, to consider an increase in the unemployment compensation taxable wage base. On each occasion, this Council has advised against the Federal taxable wage base, and have stated that such an increase was not only unnecessary for benefit financing purposes, but was in fact undesirable.

Increasing the taxable wage base at the Federal level would tend to discourage wage increases for employees and bring about more automation—thus causing more unemployment and aggravating, rather than alleviating, the problem. The States finding it necessary to find more funds for benefit purposes have on their own initiative increased their taxable wage bases.

House Resolution 8282 undermines and destroys the concept of "experience rating," which offers employers tax advantages for maintaining employment at steady levels. The Senate Finance Committee's report on the 1935 social security bill stated:

"We propose, as a further amendment, a provision that the Federal Government shall recognize credits in the form of lower contribution rates which may be granted by the States to employers who have stabilized their employment * * * all unemployment cannot be prevented by employers, but many employers can do much more than they have done in the past to regularize employment. Everyone will agree that it is much better to prevent unemployment than to compensate it."

The "experience rating" system has largely been responsible for encouraging stabilized employment, elimination of fraud and has effectively engaged the employers' interest and active support in maintaining an adequate trust fund and a prudent unemployment compensation program.

Benefit increases and extending coverage: By tying average weekly benefits to average weekly gross wages, House Resolution 8282 would produce some stunning increases in the payment of unemployment compensation. The bill would extend coverage to every employer who employs even one person for as much as 20 weeks in a year. All told, an additional 4.6 million new workers would be brought under the program. The costs of extending coverage to this new group of workers could become astronomical in that it covers a group where the incidence of unemployment runs high.

Disqualification: H.R. 8282 permits payment of unemployment compensation to the undeserving, changing the present insurance system into a welfare giveaway—severance pay program. States would be prohibited from disqualifying an individual for more than 6 weeks even though he quit the job voluntarily without good cause, was fired for willful misconduct or refused suitable work while drawing benefits.

The purpose of unemployment compensation was, and we trust still is, to tide over during short-term but painful periods of joblessness those employees who lose their jobs through no fault of their own. The

program should of necessity be geared to the economic conditions existing within the particular State. The Federal Government's role should be limited to supplementing benefits for unemployed workers who have exhausted their State benefit rights, to become effective during periods of national depression or other nationwide conditions warranting such supplemental benefits.

It is our considered opinion that the provisions of H.R. 8282 which prescribe certain predetermined blanket benefit standards for all States by limiting the Federal tax credit on one hand by completely eliminating such Federal tax credit on the other hand, thereby enforcing adherence by penalty, are unreasonable and constitute an unnecessary encroachment of Federal control into the socioeconomic area of unemployment compensation programs which have been and continue to be best served by remaining within the determination and control of those nearest the issue and most directly concerned; namely, the respective States.

Thank you.

GOP Sees Issue in Expanded War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I have permission to insert in the Appendix of the Record an article by Tom Wicker appearing in the New York Times, February 2, 1966, entitled "GOP Sees Issue in Expanded War."

Similar stories have appeared in other newspapers around the country as well as in other media.

I, for one, do not want to accuse the Republican Party of playing partisan politics with this Nation's very security. Certainly the major political parties of the country owe loyalty and allegiance to their Government and its security above all else. I want to be confident that neither of them would play cheap politics with such an important issue.

However, publicity on this matter has been so widespread that I am sure it creates doubt in the minds of those who love their country first and their party no better than second.

I do suppose, however, the Korean war and the irresponsible literature distributed during the 1952 presidential campaign remain fresh in many minds.

At any rate, I insert the article and I am sure the Republican Party will want to take every step to refute its inferences and further, will make sure such predictions as to its future action will prove to be false.

GOP SEES ISSUE IN EXPANDED WAR

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON.—Republican congressional strategists believe divisions within the Democratic Party and the prospect of an expanding land war in Vietnam may be giving them a winning political issue against President Johnson.

They believe the country may eventually turn against a President whose party does not fully support him and whose war policy may produce long casualty lists without military victory or a negotiated settlement.

To take political advantage of this, the Republican leaders are pulling back from direct criticism of the Johnson policy and are de-emphasizing their former hard line on how the war should be conducted.

Since Mr. Johnson is Commander in Chief, they reason, they will not insist that he follow a particular course or attempt to impose a Republican strategy on him. The net effect, these leaders hope, will be to concentrate political as well as constitutional responsibility for the war squarely on the President.

By 1968, they believe, Mr. Johnson may be in political trouble as a result of bearing that responsibility and the country may be ready to turn to a Republican, just as it turned to General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952 during the Korean war.

In that event, some Republican strategists do not rule out the possibility that their party might run a presidential candidate who would promise to end the war by negotiations, as did General Eisenhower. They do not want to foreclose any possibility by insisting now on a Republican alternative policy on which they would have to campaign in the future.

For now, Republicans hope to exploit the division within the Democratic Party to win the House of Representatives, or to strengthen their delegation there, in the 1966 elections.

For instance, Republican leaders left almost entirely to the Democrats last week the congressional debate on resuming the bombing of North Vietnam. Some Republican Senators like GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, opposed the resumption, but Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the majority leader, carefully refrained from speaking out on what he said was a military decision that only the President could make.

In addition, Republican leaders plan to take little part in any effort to force a congressional debate on Vietnam or a limitation on the President's powers to conduct the war. Many believe dissident Democrats, who want a stronger diplomatic effort to end the war, will try to force such a debate. That would emphasize their differences, among themselves and with Mr. Johnson.

A NEW APPROACH

Republican congressional candidates next fall also will be advised to force Democratic incumbents on the defensive by making them either accept or reject President Johnson's policy. The idea would be to emphasize Democratic dissension rather than to try to win by stating a Republican policy for conducting the war.

This new approach to the politics of the Vietnamese war is in clear contrast to the earlier Republican approach of urging a stronger military policy and warning against a negotiated settlement.

It reflects the general political uncertainty about the depth of public support for the Vietnamese war, as well as a desire to maintain a flexible position of support for the Commander in Chief without being pinned to a fixed policy for winning the war.

It also reflects some Republicans' resentment at the President, who they believe has sought their support for tough measures like bombing the North but who has not attempted to associate them with more immediately popular developments like the pause in the bombing and the peace offensive.

The shift in Republican strategy can be clearly traced in statements by Representative GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan, the House minority leader.

In January of 1965 he insisted on a change of policy in Vietnam and called bombing supply lines in North Vietnam a "highly desirable first step." Mr. Johnson ordered the bombing of these routes in February.

A552

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

February 7, 1966

URGED WAR DECLARATION

In July Mr. Ford urged air attacks on Soviet-supplied missiles in North Vietnam, not long before the President ordered the missile sites bombed. In August the Republican leader called for a declaration of war.

Also in August, Republicans under Mr. Ford's leadership issued a "white paper" on the war charging that Mr. Johnson, in seeking a negotiated settlement, "seemed to discard the independence of South Vietnam as an objective" of the war.

But when Congress reconvened this year, Mr. Ford's first newsletter to his constituents took a different tone.

"We will support anything which Mr. Johnson does to obtain a prompt, just, and secure peace," he wrote. "If this can be accomplished by immediate negotiations through diplomatic channels, we favor such negotiations. If the Commander of Chief finds that further military action is necessary to achieve freedom and independence for the Vietnamese, we will support such action. Knowing that there is no substitute for victory, we will back the President in his every effort to achieve military or diplomatic success."

The concluding word, "success," appeared to observers here to be the key to the statement. In effect, the Republican leader was backing Mr. Johnson fully, both diplomatically and militarily; but he was also insisting that the Johnson policy produce "freedom and independence for the Vietnamese."

Statements by former Vice President Richard M. Nixon also seem to reflect the developing Republican position. Mr. Nixon conferred with Republican Congressmen before appearing on "Issues and Answers" on American Broadcasting Co. television last Sunday.

In that appearance he attacked Democrats who took "the appeasement line" but refrained from direct criticism of Mr. Johnson.

Again, a New War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph Alsop has given a very good analysis of the Vietnam war and the changes which have taken place in his column published in the Washington Post. His column follows:

AGAIN, A NEW WAR

SAIGON.—Behind all the churning and wallowing and tergiversation of American policy in these last 6 weeks, there is one very simple, bleak fact. The war in Vietnam has been radically transformed, almost to the point of becoming a new war.

The last major transformation occurred last summer, with the commitment of U.S. ground forces on a big scale. The President's decision to make this commitment was extremely courageous, and the commitment paid off magnificently.

Largely as a result of Secretary McNamara's reform and modernization of the Armed Forces, every unit committed was hard trained and combat ready. Green troops fought like veterans. Brilliant victories were won against heavy odds—which will no doubt surprise a lot of people at home, for we in the United States for some strange reason, were only told about the casualties and not about the victories.

In consequence, by the beginning of November, "the Vietcong main forces were nearly on the ropes." This summary was

given by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. His view is shared by just about every other American out here with experience to form a judgment. At this juncture, however, the next transformation of the war began to be evident.

Precisely because the American commitment threatened to break the fighting strength of the Vietcong main force, as well as the North Vietnamese units already in South Vietnam, a massive further invasion of South Vietnam by North Vietnamese regulars was ordered in Hanoi. The new units swiftly moving in quite naturally upset the whole balance of the war.

This led, in turn, to the exceedingly grim briefing given to Secretary McNamara when he was last here. The chances are, in truth, that it was much too grim. For example, the North Vietnamese were credited with the capability of laying down 138 tons a day on the South Vietnamese border, via the Ho Chi Minh Trail. This tonnage, of course, would sustain all too many North Vietnamese divisions.

In fact, however, if the enemy is currently laying down 60 tons a day on the border, he is now doing a lot better than the wisest analysts believe. Furthermore, distribution from the border forward to the fighting units of 138 tons a day would require an army of at least 80,000 coolies, who would in turn consume about 65 tons of rice day.

Thus there can be little doubt that Secretary McNamara was given an exaggerated picture of the number of additional North Vietnamese units that can be permanently supported in South Vietnam. "Permanently" is the key word, however, for the desperate decision to eat up all the stocks accumulated and cached in the jungles by the Vietcong would, of course, permit a good many additional units to be temporarily supported. And in any case, without regard to future capabilities, the stepped up North Vietnamese invasion of the South had already created a wholly new situation.

Secretary McNamara's report on the demands of the new situation thereupon touched off the churning and wallowing in U.S. policy, typified by the peace offensive and the bombing pause. But no amount of wallowing and churning can change the necessities, as the outcome has shown. Three additional divisions, either three American or two American and one South Korean, are needed to redress the balance and recapture the initiative enjoyed in October.

This increase in General Westmoreland's troop requirement, from six to nine division equivalents, in turn means a requirement for more U.S. troops than can be rapidly provided without calling up the Reserves. For the time being, the President may perhaps think he can escape from meeting General Westmoreland's requirement by one dodge or another. If so, the enemy will soon enough teach him his error.

It is far more likely, however, that the President thinks he can meet General Westmoreland's requirement without calling up the Reserves, by using a whole series of clever dodges. For example, all sorts of specialized troop units, easily obtainable by a callup, are desperately needed to break the logistical logjam here, without which larger forces cannot easily be supported.

But at the cost of some delay, private contractors can be hired to attack the logistical logjam. By the same token, the Army's authorized troop strength has been greatly increased. Ready divisions may therefore be borrowed from the United States, with skeleton divisions taking their place in the Strategic Reserve.

But such dodges are dangerous and unworthy. They mean delay when speed is vital. They mean a further show of irresolution when stern resolve is vital. They mean no margin for the future, when the conspicuous existence of a margin is vital. Thus

Lyndon Johnson's fiber, as a leader of a nation at war, is now being put to a supreme test.

Where Were the Pickets? Nowhere To Be Seen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a newspaper in my congressional district has raised a very pertinent and interesting question. Where were the antiwar demonstrators last month when the United States undertook its worldwide peace offensive? It is now apparent that the Vietcong, Hanoi, and other members of the international Communist conspiracy have thumbed their collective noses at President Johnson's 37-day bombing pause and his peace missions throughout the world.

If the noisy pacifists in America were sincere in their desire for a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam conflict, it appears that demonstrations against the Hanoi regime would have been in order. But they are not sincere. As a matter of fact, this is added proof that they are simply disloyal persons intent on embarrassing America and giving aid, comfort, and political help to our enemies.

An editorial appearing in the February 1 edition of the Tifton, Ga., Daily Gazette, concludes that the Vietnicks operate under a double standard.

I wholeheartedly concur with the editorial which follows:

WHERE WERE THE PICKETS? NOWHERE TO BE SEEN

Any time during the past month would have been an ideal time for a demonstration by the Vietnam war protesters—a demonstration not against the United States but against the Hanoi regime.

It was that long and more since this country first halted bombing raids over North Vietnam. For 4 days during the Vietnamese new year's celebrations our troops maintained a strictly defensive posture, although the Vietcong's unilateral cease-fire did not include Americans.

In the meantime, Presidential peace emissaries continued to scurry between Washington and a dozen world capitals seeking the diplomatic formula that could lead to an armistice.

Why did we not see a march on Washington, or at least a few pickets outside the White House, to dramatize support for these efforts of the Government? Why no mass meetings putting a bit of pressure on the North Vietnamese who, as they themselves said, have been heartened by the activities of peace-loving American students?

Why indeed?

The silence of the past weeks has done more than the noisiest demonstration to expose the double standard of the Vietnicks and to prove the shallowness, naivete, and essential futility of their cause.

This is not to charge them with the blame for the failure of the peace offensive. They are not that important, and in any event a demonstration in support of the Government at this stage would probably have

counted for little in the international balance.

It would, however, have been a welcome gesture of moderation and conciliation at home and have gone far toward reversing the trend that seems to be driving Americans into two extreme camps.

Thomas M. O'Ryan: A Professional Profile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay homage to a distinguished citizen of Memphis, Tenn.—Thomas M. O'Ryan, chairman of the board of O'Ryan & Batchelder, Inc., largest transit advertising firm in the United States. Tom O'Ryan's story reads like a chapter from the saga of Horatio Alger. His amazing rise in our free enterprise system has been the subject of a United Press International success profile, and his career will be the subject of a chapter in a forthcoming book on outstanding American businessmen.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix to the RECORD a profile of this outstanding American and resident of the Ninth Congressional District of Tennessee:

PROFESSIONAL PROFILES THOMAS M. O'RYAN, CHAIRMAN, O'RYAN & BATCHELDER, INC.

A 19-year-old Irish immigrant named O'Ryan applied for work with a New York section gang in 1932.

The job, digging a subway tunnel through Manhattan's bedrock.

Thirty years later, a new advertising poster went up in New York subways: "An O'Ryan & Batchelder Operation."

It was the same O'Ryan.

In the years between, Thomas Michael O'Ryan had become chairman of the Nation's largest transit advertising firm. When he was awarded the New York subways advertising franchise in 1962, O'Ryan had progressed from subway laborer to subway advertising czar.

His story begins in Ireland.

A. PLUSH TIMES ON THE AULD SOD

Tom O'Ryan, second of six sons born (in 1912) to Edward O'Ryan and Mary Cusack O'Ryan in Limerick City, Ireland, didn't exactly begin life with a silver spoon in his mouth.

In 1928, a family financial crisis developed. The elder O'Ryan's business plunged downward. Mary O'Ryan decided to make extra money opening a small hotel. Edward O'Ryan's wrath was old fashioned and quite Irish.

"No matter what happens, a woman's place is in the home," he raged.

The rift grew. Living at home became untenable.

B. STREETS PAVED WITH GOLD

At 17, Tom O'Ryan booked passage for the United States.

With \$400 he arrived in New York in September 1929, registered at a YMCA, began jobhunting.

Within a short time, he was hired as a file clerk at a salary of \$27.50 every 2 weeks. Indeed, the streets were paved with gold.

One month later, the stock market crashed. Tom O'Ryan was out of a job.

C. JOBBUNTERS ON COBBLESTONES

The era of wonderful nonsense skidded to a fast stop. In job interview lines, O'Ryan often heard:

"Look at that Irish immigrant taking jobs away from good American citizens."

Even that traditional Irish haven, the police department, was closed to O'Ryan as a noncitizen.

Right then O'Ryan filed citizenship papers. Later, he was awarded citizenship in the minimum time possible.

O'Ryan took spot jobs on boats. He worked as a messenger. He even applied as doorman at Radio City Music Hall.

"Sorry," the Music Hall's chief of service said. "You're big—but you're not big enough."

Would there be an usher's job available? "You're too big to qualify as an usher," the chief said.

Size did prove helpful in landing the subway tunneling job. Unfortunately, it didn't last long.

D. DO IT YOURSELF SALES AND ADVERTISING

One day, as a messenger, O'Ryan delivered a package to a company trying to sell a consignment of damaged men's suits.

He volunteered to take on the job, investing his last few dollars in sales brochures describing the suits. Soon he was holding sales meetings during lunch periods, handing out brochures, taking orders.

"Within 20 days, I had sold several hundred suits," O'Ryan said.

E. THE BIG RHUBARB

Then, bitten by the free enterprise bug, O'Ryan borrowed \$20, rented a horse and wagon for \$4 per day. Every morning, at 4 a.m. he would arrive at New York's wholesale vegetable center, buy a load of produce, then clop-clop over the Brooklyn Bridge to sell it house to house in Flatbush. Often it was 10 p.m. when he reached home.

"On a good day, I made enough to buy food—for the horse," O'Ryan said.

"Why not specialize?" a friend asked.

That sounded good. O'Ryan chose rhubarb. He bought stocks of rhubarb, stored the boxes in his landlady's basement.

Unfortunately, the hot-water pipes caused fermentation in the rhubarb. The house took on a most distinctive smell. Pedestrians began using the other side of the street.

O'Ryan's landlady was irate. Only native Gaelic charm—and an offer to whitewash her cellar free of charge—saved the day.

At that time, to the envy of friends, O'Ryan got a full-time job as elevator operator at Saks Department Store. O'Ryan, soon catching the eye of management, was promoted to floorwalker.

F. BONANZA TO THE SANDWICH ISLANDS

From Saks, O'Ryan kept an eye on Wall Street. When he heard a brokerage house was hiring runners, he took the job at pay no higher than his Saks salary. He figured investment opportunity as a side benefit.

Soon he was investing a few dollars, then plowing it back. He parlayed his capital into several hundred dollars. When he had accumulated close to \$5,000, his longtime dream of a tropical island became stronger. Why not go to the island paradise—Hawaii?

He quit his job and booked passage.

In Hawaii, he became restless. He started teaching school part time. Money dwindled steadily. When he got down to passage money, he sailed for San Francisco. He then crossed the continent in his entire fortune: a secondhand car with Hawaiian plates.

"I soon realized I could have gone to Hawaii and invested my money at the same time," he said. "I made a mistake: living off capital. I never did that again."

In 1936, he returned to Saks 34th Street store—broke, tanned, wiser. By 1937, Saks had promoted O'Ryan to assistant to dress buyer at \$75 per week.

G. ENTER: TRANSIT ADVERTISING

Back in 1890, Tennessee's Barron G. Collier started selling streetcar ads in Memphis. By the time O'Ryan went to Saks, Collier was selling and servicing transit advertising throughout the United States.

In 1938, O'Ryan heard Collier was hiring salesmen in New York. He applied. The sales manager raised his eyebrows at the lusty Irish brogue.

"Ever sell transit advertising?"

"No."

"Look, fellow, we're turning down experienced salesmen," the manager said. "What makes you think you can do it?"

"I'm willing to work," said O'Ryan, turning red. "If I don't sell anything, don't pay me. Try me and see."

If a man offered to pay his own expenses, he must have confidence, at least.

"You're on," he told O'Ryan. "Twenty-five dollars per week draw."

O'Ryan joined several new men in for training. Then Collier announced out-of-town territories. O'Ryan was told:

"Your territory is Georgia and the Carolinas. You leave tonight."

Although he'd never been south, O'Ryan suspected a greenhorn Irishman would not be particularly welcome. However, admitting defeat was not within O'Ryan's character. He caught a train.

H. IRISHMAN IN GEORGIA

O'Ryan will never forget his first prospect—Craig's Honey Bread—in Columbus, Ga.

"Young man, we've never used your advertising, and we don't intend to start now," the baker told him.

O'Ryan went back Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. No sale. On Saturday, he took a new tack.

"I've been taught to answer all sorts of objections," he said, spreading his literature on the table. "Anything you ask I can find—even if I don't know the answer."

The baker sighed, "Looks like I'm going to have to have it. Better sign me up."

O'Ryan said later, "I think he bought so he could close shop and go home. But it gave me a big lift. After that, I started selling."

And sell he did. In 1938, O'Ryan ranked No. 1 in the Nation among Collier salesmen in bringing in 5-year contracts—the longest term sold. In 1939, O'Ryan's outstanding sales record won him promotion to Collier district manager for Tennessee, Mississippi, and Arkansas.

I. OUT OF TRAGEDY, NEW OPPORTUNITY

In 1940, shortly after founder Collier's death, the organization went bankrupt. Funds from the advertising business had financed disastrous real estate ventures.

O'Ryan joined a newly organized nationwide firm—National Transitads. He became southern division manager in 1942. When he became a vice president in 1944, he moved to Memphis, his home and business headquarters since. In the meantime, he made permanent contributions to the transit advertising field—

In Oklahoma City when all interior transit space was sold, O'Ryan developed the first exterior bus poster. (Exterior transit ads had been carried by streetcars. This was the first exterior bus poster.) Today, 65.9 percent of transit's volume comes from exterior vehicle posters.

O'Ryan expanded the exterior poster into the prototype of today's king-size poster—the mass display panel seen today on buses throughout the United States.

O'Ryan organized and served as first dean of National Transitads new sales school.

February 7, 1966

J. THE TOM O'RYAN ADVERTISING COMPANY

In 1947, O'Ryan resigned. In 1948, he formed Tom O'Ryan Advertising Co. He began by signing an agreement to manage bus advertising in Memphis. In 1949, he acquired the Atlanta franchise.

In 1951, Tom O'Ryan was looking for a dramatic way to help Libby Foods get distribution for a new product. His reasoning: Why not put samples of advertising and the product on a bus—then drive it directly to wholesalers and retailers?

Thus the first merchandising bus was born. Since that time, O'Ryan has directed dozens of merchandising bus promotions. Other transit ad firms have put the concept to work, too.

K. O'RYAN AND BATCHELDER

In November 1953, a nine-city transit system in the Carolinas called for advertising bids. O'Ryan's firm was invited. So was Transit Advertising Co., Peoria, Ill., operated by Joseph H. Batchelder, Jr.

O'Ryan, who knew Batchelder from industry meetings, telephoned him and suggested: "Why not come by Memphis, and we'll go together?"

Batchelder agreed.

On the plane from Memphis to Charlotte, N.C., Tom O'Ryan and Joe Batchelder found considerable common ground in business philosophy. By the time plane landed, the two men had decided to bid as O'Ryan and Batchelder.

The new combination got the contract. O'Ryan & Batchelder, Inc., was underway.

By 1955, O. & B. was offering transit advertising in Charleston, W. Va., Indianapolis, Louisville, Milwaukee—plus 19 other cities. By 1960, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore had been added. Chicago was signed in 1964.

Today, O. & B. holds franchises in 70 U.S. urban areas. Advertising coverage throughout nearly 25,000 vehicles makes O. & B. the Nation's largest transit advertising company. O. & B. sales volume during 1965 was more than \$16 million.

Tom O'Ryan, in the meantime, has been chairman of Transit Advertising Association, his industry's trade group. He was a prime mover in forming the World Transad Association—with members in the United States, France, Italy, Canada. He represents his industry as board member of Brand Names Foundation.

But for O'Ryan—a most active chairman of the Memphis-based O. & B. network—the best recognition came in 1962 when his firm acquired the New York subway advertising franchise. The immigrant Irish laborer had returned to the subways—in style.

Hon. Brady Gentry of Tyler, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article that was written by Mr. Dale Thorn, of the Tyler Morning Telegraph, Tyler, Tex., about Hon. Brady Gentry, one of the finest and most beloved citizens of Tyler and Texas as a whole. The article was reprinted in the Kilgore News Herald, on Tuesday, January 18, 1966.

Judge Gentry served with many of those who yet are Members of Congress.

We all are pleased he is making a splendid recovery and wish for him every happiness and success in the future.

RECOVERING FROM ILLNESS—BRADY GENTRY REMEMBERED FOR SERVICE IN CONGRESS

(By Dale Thorn)

Each afternoon, Brady Gentry walks his niece from his fourth-floor hospital room to the front door of Medical Center Hospital.

About 2 months ago (November 7, to be exact), the former third district Congressman was stricken by a cerebral hemorrhage causing speech problems and partial paralysis of the upper and lower extremities.

Today, only the speech problem remains and the 70-year-old native east Texan is greatly improved, according to his niece, Mrs. Oscelle Thompson of 1223 Peach.

Ten years ago, while still a Member of the House, Gentry was in his prime. Just before Gentry's retirement from Congress, Representative CLARK FISHER of San Angelo paid tribute to the quiet-spoken Tyler solon, describing him as "the most interesting person I have met in Congress during the 14 years I have served."

"Never a party hack or a narrow party-liner," Fisher continued, "Brady Gentry always put the good of the country ahead of political considerations as he cast his votes."

"What greater tribute can be paid any man? His stature rises high above the run of party politics and back-scratching techniques."

On the Washington scene 4 years and seldom raising his voice in the House, Gentry won recognition as one who diligently informed himself on bills and voted his convictions with apparently no regard for party lines or political expediency.

In this and other respects, he was recognized as one of the most unorthodox politicians in Congress. He often voted in patterns that might be expected to lose a man support among his constituents.

Yet, in his one bid for reelection, against a formidable foe, he came out on top. In 1954 he defeated the man who had preceded him, LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Glade-water, who in 1952 made an unsuccessful bid for the U.S. Senate against Price Daniel.

Gentry spent virtually the entire campaign period of 1954 in Washington and repeatedly told friends that Beckworth was very popular and would probably beat him.

But Gentry won in a close vote and Beckworth returned to Congress in 1957 after Gentry stepped down. Ironically, the only election Gentry ever lost was a congressional election back in the 1930's.

The victor in that race was a former school-teacher by the name of LINDLEY BECKWORTH. In 1957 Gov. Price Daniel named Gentry as chairman of the State highway commission. In making the appointment, the Governor referred to Gentry as "the best informed person on highway administration and legislation."

Gentry declined Daniel's appointment, but earlier, from 1939 to 1945, he had served as chairman of the commission and was president of the American Association of State Highway Officials in 1943. In the House he served on the Committee on Highways and Roads.

During his four terms as county judge of Smith County, one of his major achievements was the development of an improved system of county roads.

Later, he took the lead in the program to correlate the State and National highway systems.

A bachelor, Gentry was born on a farm near Colfax, in Van Zandt County, on March 25, 1895. He borrowed money from a Van Zandt County farmer to pay for his education at Cumberland University and Tyler Commercial College.

His first political job was a clerkship in the Van Zandt County tax collector's office.

After moving to Tyler he served first as assistant city tax collector, then as county attorney and later as county judge.

With his background of farm life, Gentry has always had a warm spot in his heart for the man who follows the plow. It was under his leadership that the Texas system of farm-to-market roads was established.

For over 20 years, Gentry has taken an avid interest in the golfing career of Ben Hogan and traveled all over the United States to watch him play in tournaments.

A member of Willow Brook Country Club, Gentry has never had much interest in playing the game himself, but last spring a Dallas sportswriter tagged him with the title "Ben Hogan's Shadow."

In Congress Gentry was a conservative. He preached governmental economy and was opposed to foreign aid on the scale proposed by the national administration.

Today, Brady Gentry looks forward to regaining his full strength and leaving the hospital.

Gentry seldom bothers to reminisce about his past—a record of achievement that rivals Horatio Alger stories.

Politics may never again know such an unpolitical man.

The United Nations and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, now that the Vietnam issue is before the U.N. Security Council the delegates there will no doubt discover some of the difficulties the United States has struggled with in its efforts to deal with the Communists in southeast Asia.

The U.S. resolution to the U.N. Security Council on Vietnam recommended that "appropriate interested governments" arrange a conference "looking toward the application of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and 1962 and the establishment of a durable peace in southeast Asia."

In an editorial of February 2, 1966, the Chicago Daily News stated that the United States "comes to the U.N. at a time when all else seems to have failed."

Yet, the editorial says, "If it does nothing else, the United States appeal to the U.N. Security Council cuts the ground from under some of the critics of the administration's Vietnam policy."

The Daily News reminds us that the U.N. members "have seen for themselves how Hanoi and Peiping rejected all U.S. peace overtures."

Because of its realistic analysis of an issue with which we all must deal realistically, I hereby include the editorial in the RECORD:

THE U.N. TACKLES VIETNAM

If it does nothing else, the United States appeal to the U.N. Security Council cuts the ground from under some of the critics of the administration's Vietnam policy. These critics have protested long and loudly that the proper way to handle the Vietnam problem was to dump it in the lap of the United Nations, as if that body had a magical solution for every problem anywhere.

Some of the reasons why the U.N. was not earlier and formally brought into the Vietnam war are quite apparent now that the step has been taken. The first and perhaps the only result is to bring into the U.N. chamber the same acrimonious debate that has been raging outside it.

Moreover, the formal setting of this debate seems more likely to harden attitudes than soften them, and force irreversible decisions by record voting, including the use of the U.N. veto. Perhaps this no longer matters; at this stage attitudes have already hardened, and the formality of voting may not change the situation.

For all practical purposes, the United Nations has been involved in the Vietnam war all along, if only on an informal basis. whatever advantages now comes of involving it formally is largely tactical, for the situation in Vietnam is hardly comparable to those that have been resolved in the past by U.N. intervention. The only rough parallel is Korea, and the U.N. was able to act then only because Russia was on a temporary "walkout" at the time.

Nevertheless, the United States comes to the U.N. at a time when all else seems to have failed. The members of the U.N. have seen for themselves how Hanoi and Peking have rejected all U.S. peace overtures. And they have seen how North Vietnam—not the United States—certainly rejected in advance any ideas for a settlement the United Nations might produce.

This in itself ought to be proof for the U.N. as to who wants peace and who doesn't. Unfortunately, proof of this kind isn't what tips the scales in the United Nations, any more than it alters the opinion of those in this country who would have peace at the price of dishonor.

Indiana Celebrates Its Sesquicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, this year, 1966, Indiana celebrates its sesquicentennial year.

The accomplishments of the people of Indiana during the past 150 years have been many, and the contributions to the Nation in times of peace and war have been a source of pride to all Hoosiers.

In the January 1966, issue of the Hoosier Farmer, the official magazine of the Indiana Farm Bureau, a very authentic and interesting portrayal of the era in America when Indiana was settled appears.

In order that the Members of Congress share in the knowledge contained in this interesting article, under unanimous consent, I request its publication in the RECORD.

The article follows:

The American Revolution was underway. The British were on the move and as they strengthened their garrisons across this young country, they gathered into their fold the Indians who were violently in opposition to the American settlement.

Virginia, under the governorship of Patrick Henry, claimed title to the Northwest, and hence to Vincennes, under her charter of 1609. When American spies learned that Fort Sackville, the English fort at Vincennes, was

undermanned, Governor Henry made the momentous decision to send an army to capture it. To do the job, he called upon a militia officer who represented the county of Kentucky in the Virginia Legislature; George Rogers Clark.

Governor Henry commissioned Clark a lieutenant colonel, authorized him to draw 1,200 pounds from Virginia's treasury, and to enlist an army for the confrontation. By May of 1778, Clark had gathered in 150 men and he assembled them on the Ohio River near the present city of Jeffersonville. On July 4, 1778, he moved against the British, first capturing Kaskaskia. On July 14, he moved onward to Fort Sackville. To his amazement, the British garrison had left and the American flag was raised without a shot being fired.

When the British commander at Detroit got news of Clark's success, he was enraged. In December, he rushed 600 troops to Vincennes and recaptured this beleaguered outpost. Again the British flag went up.

When Clark, who had returned to Kaskaskia, heard the news, he decided to retake the fort. This momentous decision to march again upon Fort Sackville has been recorded as one of the great moments in Hoosier history.

Unknown at first to Clark was the decision of the British commander at Fort Sackville to release most of his troops for the winter. Clark would never have learned of this had it not been for the heroic journey of Francis Vigo, a rich trader of Vincennes, who fled the town and took the news to Clark.

With Vigo's financial backing, Clark managed to scrape together 170 volunteers. On February 23, he set up camp just 2 miles from the fort. While his men cleaned their firearms, Clark sent a message to the inhabitants of Vincennes, warning them of the impending attack. That night they moved forward.

The fort was quickly surrounded and Clark began a harassing barrage of rifle fire. With the morning came an increased barrage so furious the Britishers in the fort could not get into position to return the fire. With only 30 able-bodied defenders, and 600 miles from help, Fort Sackville surrendered. At 10 a.m. on the morning of February 25, 1779, the American flag was raised again over Vincennes never to come down again.

The consequence of this battle was to be of significant importance to the Colonies and to the growth and expansion of the United States. Virginia ceded Vincennes to the United States in 1784. The formation of the Northwest Territory followed in 1787. Within a year, 20,000 Americans came down the Ohio to the new land, for with the Northwest Territory came the prohibition of slavery, public education, and the guarantee of religious freedom and civil rights to all people. And when the Indiana territory was created in 1800, Vincennes became the seat of government.

The early Indiana pioneer was hardworking and practical. The new country offered a challenge to muscle rather than to mind. The early settler contented himself with the limited culture he had brought with him. The family Bible and sometimes one other book were the extent of his cultural tools.

The woman had the most difficult time. She usually had only an iron skillet for cooking. The only lamp was a clay pot filled with bear grease. The food she put on the table consisted of cornbread, wild berries, plums and apples, turnips, potatoes, and all sorts of wild game and fish.

These early trailblazers had their good times in spite of the daily struggle for existence. The boys rassed, ran foot races, and participated in shooting matches. Standard amusements included sugar making, bee hunting, husking bees, and apple cuttings.

An early Hoosier citizen, one Randall Yarbro, when interviewed in 1889, recalled seeing the first house built in Jeffersonville—a one-

story loghouse. He helped his father build the second one in 1811.

At that time roads were only worn paths or perhaps corduroy (logs laid close together across the path). Horseback or foot was the only means of travel. Some progressive persons learned from the Indians and built drags—two shafts with their one end tied on either side of a horse and the other dragging the ground with a box of a seat.

Even wagons were a rarity. Yarbro reports that the first two-horse wagons were as much a curiosity as were the first telephones or "iron horses."

Money then was also a rarity. Most commerce was carried out by barter and trading. The man who had a dollar of good money was a wealthy person. Beaver skins and pelts were often a medium of exchange.

Times have indeed changed since those first hardy Hoosiers crossed the Ohio River and moved north or followed the rivers south from Wayne County. Fantastic changes have occurred in the past 150 years.

During 1966, our Indiana sesquicentennial year, the Hoosier Farmer will examine the times and tales of those pioneer days. And along the way we will consider too, some of the great men who have forged and shaped the history and the heritage of our State and Nation. And, too, we will report upon special events that will commemorate our Indiana sesquicentennial and 150 years of progress.

How Could Anybody Desert Them Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial by the owner of the Martins Ferry-Bellaire Times Leader, Mr. A. V. Dix, who is one of the owners of the Dix newspapers in Ohio and Kentucky. I think this should be must reading for every Member of Congress and especially those who say we should pull out of Vietnam. Mr. Dix has been to the Far East several times, and I consider his knowledge on political matters in that area to be outstanding.

How Could Anybody Desert Them Now?

It was a sweltering day in Saigon, as most of them are.

Standing on the corner of Tu Do, which, under French rule had been called Catinat Boulevard, and the wide street that runs along the Saigon River, I watched a big, white Navy transport, one of ours, standing at the dock, its decks crowded with poorly clad Vietnamese, all pushing against the ship's rails staring at a great city which until that morning had been only a name to them.

Earlier that morning, from the roof of the Majestic Hotel I had watched its progress up the Saigon River, a sludgy stream, full of garbage and filth, human and otherwise, all the way from Cap St. Jacques. It had come from Haiphong, far to the north, where it had picked up its human cargo of Vietnamese fleeing from the advancing forces of Ho Chi Minh's Communist army. Many of them had been taken off the beaches when the Communists entered the city and made their way to the docks in an attempt to halt the exodus.

Along Catinat, and other nearby streets, the sidewalks were full of refugees who had

February 7, 1966

come earlier. They had been living there for days, doing their cooking, washing, giving birth to babies, and, some of them dying, waiting to be moved to refugee camps and later to resettlement areas.

Soon the moving began, and then the big white ship began to spew forth its human cargo to take the places of the people on the sidewalks until they, too, could be moved.

All of their possessions, except the little they could carry on their backs, had been abandoned in their flight.

They were frightened and hungry. They had been told by the Communists the Americans were cruel sadists, and even cannibals who might kill them and grind them into hamburger. These stories were told them by a people who themselves had tortured those they were able to capture in their escape attempt. Viet Minh soldiers caught one escaping boy, put his bare feet on a rock, and beat them to a pulp with rifle butts. "Now walk to freedom," they told him. The boy crawled to freedom and was in a Saigon hospital where a then U.S. Navy doctor, a Lieutenant Dooley, was trying to save his feet. They had driven a row of tacks, more than 100 of them, around the top of one man's head. "There is your crown of thorns," they told him. And they had driven bamboo chopsticks through the eardrums of another because they suspected him of listening to a Bible reading by a priest.

Other ships came later. The Saigon River is so winding and so obscured by high reed grass that the ships seemed to be skimming right over the meadows.

They could come in only with the tide which along with the ships brought back the fifth it had taken seaward earlier in the day as the tide went out. To turn around they must nose the prow firmly against a muddy bank, swing the stern around, then back off and head back downstream.

They did this time and again until nearly a million refugees had flooded into Saigon, and meanwhile uncounted thousands more fled over the border at the 17th parallel a little north of the old capital of Hue. On the way down they were given generous portions of sticky rice. Many, thinking it might be their last meal for days, hoarded it. They would compress it into balls and hide it in remote corners of the ship where it would later be traced through a fetid odor.

It was quite an operation, especially as much of it went on under the guns of Saigon's Binh Xuyen rebellion which was aided and abetted by the departing French who didn't want anybody to succeed in southeast Asia as long as they couldn't have it.

Many of the tailenders were mowed down by Communist machineguns on the Hai-phong beaches, and some we just had to leave behind as they stood chest deep in the surf, pleading arms outstretched.

They finally resettled these people in villages throughout the land, providing them with meager shelter and in all about 5 acres of ground, half of it uncleared jungle.

They did very well. They improved their homes, tilled their soil, built churches and little industries. They became self-supporting even though many were preyed upon by venal small-time politicians. In fact, the entire economy of the country began to improve, and that was something the Commies in adjoining countrys just couldn't permit, if they were to stay in power.

So, the campaign started. The beginnings were small, but everything was employed. They used economic pressures, political distrust, and the very foulest sort of terror tactics. Now it has snowballed into a major affair. How it happened is of little consequence; it is now a fait accompli and we have to do something about it, or "the terror" will spill out all over Asia, and from there, who knows where.

There are those who would have us desert

these hundreds of thousands of people who put their trust in us. Should we pull out they would all be liquidated and in ways not very nice. Most of those who would have us quit Vietnam have never seen either it or any of the people who left their homes, farms or business enterprises to begin all over again under freedom, because we said it would be all right and we'd look after them.

Maybe we shouldn't have said it; maybe we shouldn't have made those promises. But the fact is, we did. And I have the feeling that if we desert them now to a certain and horrible fate, then we will face sure retribution of some sort. And maybe we'd deserve it.

Personally, I'm glad I'm not President Johnson, to face the decisions he must make. I'm afraid I wouldn't have the courage. But I've seen these things in South Vietnam many times over the years. I've seen the refugees; I've been in their new villages, in the jungles in between. I've talked to them and know their hopes and their gratitude for being saved from the Communists. So, desert them now? How could anybody?

Elbie Jay Plans a Marrying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under authority to insert my own remarks and extraneous matter in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert another column by Art Hoppe, the master satirist. His column, published in the San Francisco Chronicle, of January 30, follows:

ELBIE JAY PLANS A MARRYING

Howdy there, folks. How y'all? Time for another tee-vee visit with the rootin'-tootin' Jay family, starring ol' Elbie Jay, who can rope, hogtie and brand 500 Congressmen quicker'n a wink. 'Course, he's also got two young daughters.

As we join up with ol' Elbie today, he and his pretty wife, Birdie Bird, are in the parlor of the big white house. Birdie Bird keeps lookin' out the window and ol' Elbie appears a mite fidgity.

ELBIE. Well, I suppose we got to talk to them about the marrying. Where they from? Waukegan, Illinois? Waukegan. It ain't even in Cook County.

BIRDIE BIRD. Now, Elbie, you know Pat's a very nice boy. And I'm sure his parents are lovely.

ELBIE. Maybe so. But what's wrong with that daughter of ours? Why, she could've married a duke or a prince—some young fellow whose folks we could treat as equals.

BIRDIE BIRD. Shhhh. Here they come now. Now you be nice, you hear?

(The parents of the intended groom, a pleasant-looking middle-class couple enter. Elbie extends his hand with a professional smile.)

ELBIE. Sure nice of you to come howdy and press the flesh. That's a fine boy you got. You must be mighty proud of him, serving in his country's uniform.

GROOM'S MOTHER. Yes. Of course, every time I think of how fortunate he was to be assigned to duty right here in Washington, I thank God.

ELBIE (with a wave of his hand). Don't mention it. Glad to do it for the young man our daughter has democratically chosen as her intended. Like I said to Birdie Bird

here, "Our country ain't got no room for class distinctions."

GROOM'S FATHER. How odd. That's virtually what I said to Mother here after Pat broke the news to us.

GROOM'S MOTHER. Yes, I will admit I was a little disappointed at first. I did have my heart set on Pat marrying a college girl.

ELBIE (frowning). What do you mean? She goes to college.

GROOM'S MOTHER. Oh, yes, a nursing college, isn't it? I'd thought more of a real college. But then father here said there was no disgrace in having a nurse in the family these days. Not if she's a registered nurse. And by the way, how are her grades?

ELBIE (testily). She's had a lot on her mind lately. And her sister does real well in college.

GROOM'S MOTHER. Oh, the one that runs around with movie stars? I suppose girls in Texas do mature early, don't they? For Pat's sake, I hope so. Not that we have anything against Texans, mind you. In Waukegan we treat them as equals.

GROOM'S FATHER. Yes, as I said to mother here, "At least it beats Pat's fighting in Vietnam." And after all, I said, this is a democracy. So despite the obvious handicap of an immature wife with a penchant for notoriety who comes from the backwoods section of Texas and who is not—er—academically inclined, I'm sure that Pat will somehow still manage to go far.

ELBIE (thundering). Yep, about 10,000 miles. Just as soon as I can sign his transfer orders.

Well tune in to our next episode, friends. And meantime as you mosey on down the long trail of life, remember what Elbie's ol' granddaddy used to say:

"Tain't no use for proud daddies to fret about their tads marrying beneath 'em. They ain't got no other choice."

Little Help From Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, nations around the world extend open hands for assistance from the United States. Even our wealthiest allies depend on our trade, loans, and military support. Yet how many are standing by us today in our struggle for peace in Vietnam? Very few. Not only are they not helping us, they are speaking out against our actions. An excellent proposal to this situation was suggested in an editorial in the February 3, Knoxville, Tenn., Journal, which I ask to be printed in the RECORD:

IF ONLY LBJ DARED

A man we know recently spent a few days in the hospital. He got a letter which read this way: "There are two who are pulling for your early recovery. I am one of them and Blue Cross is the other."

Sometimes it looks as if Uncle Sam is in a predicament similar to that of our man in the hospital, except that we frequently find it impossible to name some government friendly enough to us to be counted in the same class as Blue Cross.

On cold, snowy days some Americans have time to brood over the evident lack of appreciation for the role which the United

States of America has played in modern history and especially in relation to certain governments.

American arms and troops have twice in this century saved Europe from subjugation by a powerful enemy. American arms and troops in defense against Communist aggression halted the Reds in their tracks in South Korea. The protective umbrella of these same arms and troops have been spread over Britain, Europe, Greece, Japan, the Philippines and free nations everywhere since the end of World War II.

Yet, with the exception of token contingents from Australia and South Korea, not one of these nations which have been protected by American military and financial strength for a quarter of a century has volunteered assistance in the critical South Vietnam situation. Not only has there been a lack of physical assistance from all but a few of these countries which have been the beneficiaries of our manpower and money, but we have even been denied their moral support. In the case of France, for example, we have seen a former ally actually consort with the Communists who plan the destruction of that country no less than ours.

It should be kept in mind, too, that the protection of the United States has provided for a long list of countries—more than 100 of them—which have been the recipients of the Marshall plan or other foreign aid, has been at our own expense. As a matter of fact, the tremendous cost of maintaining our military forces in Europe, for example, is one of the factors which make it impossible for the American Government to achieve a favorable balance of payments and to reduce the run on our store of gold at Fort Knox.

As a result of our insistence upon financing, in effect, the whole world, the claims against our gold supply, now reduced to about \$13 billion, are about twice that amount. Most of these I O U's are in the hands of central banks in Europe and are at least legally callable on demand.

Of course, the President will not have the nerve to do it, but this fact does not obscure the picture of action that deserves to be taken. Such action would be far more drastic than the reference he has recently made to withholding foreign aid handouts from countries which are hostile to us in every way until it comes time for them to be on the receiving end of Federal gifts.

What the President should do, if he were free to do it, would be to pull out of Europe all American troops, weapons, and equipment and to use these forces in the South Vietnam war. This would be an act of simple justice and at the same time would relieve both our adverse balance of payments and shake up the economies of every nation in which we now have our troops quartered, primarily for their own protection.

One may entertain himself on a winter's day by imagining the indignant cries of alarm and consternation that would arise if any such action were announced by the White House. Not only would deathly fear grip the chancelleries of our European friends at being left without the protection of U.S. forces against the looming threat of Russian communism, but there would be equal concern about a cessation of U.S. spending to support these forces.

The United States is still in position to protect itself from any external threat which may be brought against it. It must be conceded, however, that there is a basis for unhappiness on the part of the American people to find that we are on a one-way street when it comes to a crisis such as exists in South Vietnam. Every other nation is willing to accept help from us, but few are willing to stand with us in our need.

Bombing Only Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the shrill cries of Communist-infiltrated peacenik groups are being heard far out of proportion to their numbers and respectability. I am pleased to note that the President, as Commander in Chief, is being supported by respectable voices across the country, one of which is the Park Forest Reporter, an outstanding independent publication serving that community in Illinois, which carried a most timely editorial in its February 2 edition:

BOMBING ONLY CHOICE

Acceleration of the war in Vietnam was inevitable as Communist foes pay little attention to peace efforts. It was obvious that President Johnson ordered the resumption of bombing of military targets in the north with reluctance, still he had no other choice.

The 37-day moratorium which was used to probe every possible avenue toward a peaceful settlement of the Viet situation met a firm rebuff from a stubborn foe who remains defiant and unyielding. The Vietcong are unwilling to negotiate unless their terms of removal of all U.S. and other foreign forces from Vietnam are carried out.

From their point of view, any other compromise would be surrender, at least in the military sense. The harsh realization is that they are convinced they will win the war. They already control nearly 70 percent of South Vietnam territory. A heavily armed 200,000 man U.S. force augmented by South Viet troops has been unable to uproot them. Despite suffering heavy losses of men, they continue their harassing tactics in the face of their enemies, inflict their damages and often manage to flee undetected. Physically, it's nigh impossible to tell a friend from a foe. The enemy who an hour earlier tossed a bomb into an American billet, lolis around a South Vietnamese compound at chow time to take his meal of U.S.-provided foods.

The Vietcong is relying on what they consider the softness of Americans. They recognize that the slow bleeding process of a war which could last as long as a generation, and not completely popular in our land, will provide the impetus for an eventual pullout, similar to the defeat the French were forced to accept after a 10-year struggle in Indochina.

An unsettled South Vietnam Government adds to the confusion of a clearcut victory effort and the corrupt practices by friendly officials tends to extend the war and to accelerate its cost.

Yet only a decisive victory will turn the tide in our favor. It dictates a fight that should go all out, short of use of nuclear weapons. There are many reasons for a peace now, but it takes two to come to terms at the peace table. Hanoi just isn't ready to talk terms and our talk must become the echo of bombs raining down on their arsenals, strategic highways, and ports.

The Vietcong have as yet faced no major manpower problem. All the land battles have been fought on enemy ground. Bombings on their soil may awaken them to the reality that Uncle Sam isn't soft, has the

courage to take the fight to the enemy and will be resolute enough to persevere until the victory tide turns in his favor.

The role the United Nations will play is vague at this writing. Many of our staunchest allies have no stomach for this war, particularly in its undeclared status. If the Congress declared a state of war existed they would have to suffer the risks a blockade would create. It might take just this action to determine which of our allies are friends and which are neutrals or worse.

We don't believe that mainland China will get involved in an all-out war. They are a decade or more away from risking their very existence as a power. Their dragon may snort fire, yet they are wary enough to save their strength for a day when chances for success are not limited.

A General Benefit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, any businessman recognizes that a "good deal" is one in which both sides—or all sides—benefit.

The Government recognizes this, also. The administration's decision to raise savings bond interest rates is a realistic reaction to changing conditions in the money markets.

A higher savings bond interest rate can serve individual savers and the general economy.

Everyone stands to benefit.

Many newspapers across the land have praised the action taken to increase the interest rates. One such editorial appeared recently in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, and because I feel it is typical of many, I offer it for the RECORD.

KEEPING FAITH

President Johnson has simply recognized the Government's fiduciary responsibility to the holders and purchasers of E and H savings bonds in directing the Treasury to increase the interest rate, since interest rates paid on competitive forms of savings have climbed well above the 3½-percent E and H bond rate.

There will, of course, be some added cost to the Government. But failure to bring these bonds into line with the market could, in time, erode their attractiveness, and increase the burden on other kinds of Treasury financing. More important, the typical small saver would be cheated of his due reward unless he switched his savings to a bank or savings and loan account.

The move could have been postponed for a time, of course, until there were more definite signs of buyer resistance. But, as J. A. Livingston, the Bulletin's financial editor, noted in first calling attention to the inequity of the old rates some weeks ago, the Government owes its bond-holding citizens more consideration than market forces might, alone, require. This move to protect their interests is the proper complement to the patriotic appeal, enunciated afresh by Mr. Johnson, on which the savings bond program is founded.

February 7, 1966

Vincent J. DiMattina: A Real American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the immediate past we have seen the rise of a breed of American who has no place either in the traditions or future of this country. I refer to the draft card burners, those who deny and shirk their military obligation to the country because they "disagree" with the military policy of the administration. It is with some pride and a great deal of pleasure, therefore, that I would like to talk about Vincent J. DiMattina of Brooklyn.

Vincent J. DiMattina is the New York State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. But he is much more than that. He is, for example, a man who at the age of 16 had to leave school and go to work on the Brooklyn docks. The Brooklyn docks, like waterfronts all the world over, are a tough place to make a living. But Vincent DiMattina did. Then the war came along. In 1942 he enlisted in the Navy and after boot camp took instruction in deep sea diving and was assigned to Seabee Battalion 104. He served with that unit for almost 4 years in the Pacific theater of war and reached the rank of chief boatswain's mate by the time he was discharged in December of 1945.

Returning to Brooklyn in 1946, Commander DiMattina once again went to work on the docks. But like so many others in those days, the war had shown him that an education was not a luxury but a necessity. In Commander DiMattina's case it was not merely a return to college. He had to go back to high school. Working a full week on the docks, he somehow managed to complete his high school and then went on to college. From there it was law school. And all this while working a full, hard day. In 1954, some 8 years later, he was admitted to the bar of the State of New York.

Even more amazing, Commander DiMattina, while working and going to school, found time for an active role in veterans' affairs in Brooklyn. In 1951 he was elected county commander of the VFW in Kings County. He also managed to organize and recruit members for 16 new VFW posts in Brooklyn.

Along the way he served the VFW and his fellow veterans well. He served as Loyalty Day chairman, chairman of the department rehabilitation committee, department inspector, judge advocate, and was elected to the successive posts of junior and senior vice commander of the Department of New York. He was elected commander of the Department of New York at the 46th annual convention in Lake Placid, N.Y., on June 26, 1965.

Commander DiMattina is a member of the Brooklyn Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, U.S. Government Appeals Agent for the local draft board, a member of the civilian advisory board to the 3d Naval District, and past grand knight of the Our Lady of Loretto Council No. 585 of the Knights of Columbus. He has also served as assistant counsel to the minority leader of the New York State Assembly in 1963 and 1964 and presently is counsel to the speaker of the New York State Assembly on military and patriotic affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Vincent J. DeMattina for many years and am happy and proud that our association has led to a close and warm friendship. I would like to offer a salute to the VFW's New York Department commander, Vincent J. DiMattina—a real American.

Automotive Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, Assemblyman Alexander Chananau, a distinguished member of our New York State Legislature, recently testified before the traffic safety hearings of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Senate Government Operations Committee. Assemblyman Chananau cosponsored the 1965 safety car law in the New York State Assembly, and as an authority on automotive safety, he has spoken on a subject of major concern and interest to all of us. I wish to call Assemblyman Chananau's testimony to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY OF NEW YORK STATE ASSEMBLYMAN ALEXANDER CHANANAU, DEMOCRAT, BRONX, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, FEBRUARY 3, 1966

Chairman RIBICOFF and members of the subcommittee, as a member of this New York State Joint Legislative Committee for 3 years and cosponsor of the 1965 safety car law under which the prototype program was initiated, I can testify that it is the one program Detroit wants to stop cold.

This is bipartisan legislation we are discussing in New York State, and we hope at the congressional level. The problems this essential legislation runs into are bipartisan problems.

With Assemblyman Julius Volker, Republican, of Buffalo, I battled for it on the floor of the assembly in 1965 while Senator Speno, a Republican who had developed the program, put it through in the senate. In this matter, and in our prior and current efforts to have the first equipment and new tire safety laws passed, we felt the power of Detroit at work.

This New York State Legislative Committee has considered and legislated in every major field from visual acuity to speed limits

to alcohol impairment to drug use to psychiatric and psychological prediction.

Gentlemen, we have found that the current automobile is unnecessarily unsafe and productive of injuries and deaths, and we have found that getting essential changes made, device by device, is a long and difficult struggle.

We have followed Senator Speno's leadership in the New York Legislature as has, directly and indirectly, the rest of the Nation. We have found that obsolete concepts of salability based on styling still reign in Detroit, despite recent assurances to the contrary. As an indication, there is no one in the automobile industry in charge of safety design who has vice-presidential status, but each of the Big Three has a vice president for styling.

A much better indication is the fact that 50,000 Americans were killed last year and 3,500,000 injured by smashing around inside the interior of the car, by being projected outside the car, or by being hit by a car. We cannot stop the majority of accidents from occurring because we don't, at this point, have the knowledge which would permit such a utopia.

But we can stop the majority of the deaths and injuries from occurring because the car is readily changed for safety purposes. People are not readily changed.

In 1966, we again have bipartisan legislation under consideration to continue the safety car project, a \$250,000 appropriation directed toward Federal grant subsidies and any and all public or private financial assistance. Cosponsors at this point are Senators Speno and Liebowitz and Assemblyman Joseph M. Margiotta, Republicans of Long Island, and me, two Democrats and two Republicans. We expect trouble.

Now, what have we here before us in this feasibility report? We have the first automobile design safety check list, consisting of several hundred identified automobile hazards, the first such checklist for designers ever compiled in 50 years of automobile engineering literature.

We have proof that a car can be built, the New York State safety car prototype, that will prevent 75 percent of injuries and fatalities at crash-impacts of 50 miles per hour, 75 percent in side collisions, 90 percent in rollover accidents, and 90 percent when a car runs into the rear of another. The study before us also shows ways to reduce accidents through mechanical changes and to cut down pedestrian injuries.

We have the concept of a car designed according to aerospace systems analysis which protects astronauts.

It took 7 years of concentrated effort based on dedication and conviction to produce the safety car prototype project in New York State. We believe that we are, by experience, experts in this subject of automotive safety and we have had the advice and service of the best technicians, engineers, scientists and physicians in doing our job.

We urge the Federal Government to join us in this essential effort now, continuing the only existent safety car prototype project of its type in the world. We welcome greater Federal effort in traffic safety and trust that the enthusiasm now being shown by certain Members of the Congress and various Federal agencies will not wane. We welcome guidance from the Federal Government as time passes. Massive research projects will, we hope, be initiated and carried through. We ask you to show your intent, fighting spirit and conviction by joining us now in getting this prototype built. It will tell us all what should be done, what can be done and how to do it. It is design, safety design from the beginning, that marks the difference between this project and the "safest" car now being manufactured for sale.

dence, detailed information, and entree to the principals handling this project in Mexico."

In conclusion, the question might be asked, What has been done and what is being done? Hundreds of thousands of pages in dozens of studies have been compiled—one of which seem to give the answers some people want—so they pile up and gather dust.

The most recent of these studies is a work by Harland Padfield and William E. Martin for the University of Arizona entitled—"Farmers, Workers, and Machines." This is, in my opinion, a well prepared document, and like some other, I am afraid, their conclusions might not be what some people want.

For example, on page 294, this report states:

"Public Law 78 and Its Administration.

"1. Public Law 78 should be extended or some similar law enacted. However, no increases in the total foreign farm labor supply should be allowed.

"Even with an extension of this law, the use of Mexican national workers would decrease rapidly without the aid of restricted legislation under technological and economic pressures already set in motion. The only restriction should be on greatly increasing the importation of Mexican nationals, thus avoiding formation of some new capital-saving, labor-using technology. Ending the program now will cause chaotic conditions within some crops and regions as adoption of new methods and technologies will be forced at too rapid a rate. During this period, consumer prices may rise precipitously.

"The removal of the braceros simply implies the elimination of jobs they were performing. At the same time, the lower occupational classes, now complementary to the braceros' tasks, will be also eliminated. New but fewer jobs will be created for a different (and higher) occupational class. Continuation of the bracero program would cause these changes to occur more gradually while economic, social, and technological processes eliminate the program within the next few years in a smooth and relatively nondisruptive manner."

On page 295, we find the following:

"OTHER FORMS OF ALIEN LABOR

"To attempt to alleviate farm labor shortages by a naturalization process, such as under Public Law 414, is most undesirable. The green card worker cannot be regulated precisely in accordance with labor demand. Once admitted to the United States he is free to move to any area and any industry. If he encounters social or economic difficulty he becomes a problem to society as a whole rather than being only a farm labor cost. He is a year-round problem imported to answer a seasonal labor demand."

And we quote from page 296 of this report as follows:

"Whose responsibility are these technologically obsolete workers? To use a specific example, whose responsibility are the Anglo-isolates described in chapter 17 or the Indians described in chapter 18? Certainly we cannot blame their impoverished condition on the farmers for whom they usually work. The farm provides them a job where no other sector of our economy can. The Anglo-isolates are on the farm because they have been rejected elsewhere. The Indians are on the farm because the farm allows them to continue to participate in reservation life."

And finally, may I go back to the front of the book under "Acknowledgments"—it says this:

"This study was financed by contract funds from the Bureau of Employment Security of the U.S. Department of Labor."

A World Leader Spoke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, those who watched the President of the United States deliver his state of the Union address, either in person or on television, saw an outstanding leader at his very best.

The Detroit News, in an editorial on January 13, declared that the President "was at his best—persuasive, nonevasive, rock firm without being belligerent, determinedly hopeful for peace but offering Americans no easy way out, at times quite eloquently moving, and throughout, utterly convincing."

The editorial added, "It was the true voice of America the world heard last night."

I share this editorial view of the Detroit News, and I am sure that few other editorials, columns, or news articles analyzed or interpreted the President's state of the Union message as thoughtfully or as clearly as did the News editorial writer.

I have permission, Mr. Speaker, to have this editorial made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STATE OF THE UNION—A WORLD LEADER SPOKE

Bringing the Vietnam record up to date for the Nation, its foes and the whole world, President Johnson last night was at his best—persuasive, nonevasive, rock firm without being belligerent, determinedly hopeful for peace but offering Americans no easy way out, at times quite eloquently moving, and throughout utterly convincing.

He spoke of our military might without bragging. He underlined our decade-long commitment to the South Vietnamese people which some of his critics—but not President Johnson—would have us run out on. He warned that foe that their strategy was illusory; that the enemy was no longer close to victory and no longer had time on his side.

Mr. Johnson brought it home to the American people that not Americans alone are fighting and dying. Eight South Vietnamese died for every American who gave his life last year. And to those of his countrymen doing today in Vietnam what Americans had done before them in Flanders fields, against the forces of Hitler and Tojo and Mussolini, and in Korea, he pledged: "You will have everything you must have: every gun, every dollar, and every decision—whatever the cost and whatever the challenge."

Thankfully, he wasted no time or words on those who would snatch at peace at almost any price, that frenetic fringe ranging from professors to draft card-burning students. He had no time to waste on their state of mind in his state of the Union message.

Yet it was in this field, in his determination to seek an honorable peace that he spoke with the most warming conviction of all. Mr. Johnson said:

"We have made it clear, from Hanoi to New York, there are no arbitrary limits to our search for peace. We stand by the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962. We will meet at any conference table, discuss any proposals—4 points, or 14, or 40—

and consider the views of any group. We will work for a ceasefire now or once the discussions begin. We will respond if others reduce their use of force. We will withdraw our soldiers once South Vietnam is securely guaranteed the right to shape its own future."

It is all there. What more can a man do? What more can a foe expect? What else would the critics have him say? We stand by the terms that ended the first Vietnam war. We are prepared to stand by and for the neutrality of Laos spared 4 years ago from what its neighbors suffer today. "We will consider the views of any group." This is perhaps the most telling offer of all.

It means we now accept that we must talk to the Vietcong or its political arm, the National Liberation Front. Mr. Johnson didn't say we'd buy what they demand. He didn't promise them a seat in any future South Vietnam Government. That's up to the South Vietnamese when, safe from coercion and bullets, they can make a free choice.

He didn't contend the Reds' 4 points or his own 14 (like President Wilson's two generations ago) were the limit. The field is wide open. And, on this, he warned Americans, also, that, should a cease-fire come about, it will be only the start, not the end. There'll be a long, hard pull for all at any conference table.

He confirmed we have communicated privately with our adversaries and he publicly offered them another choice: Either a cease-fire now even before negotiations begin—a tacit, unpoliced moratorium—or when talks are underway. He did not set a time limit on our bombing pause, which was wise. We have an obligation to our GI's on the ground, too. But he did say: "We will respond if others reduce their use of force."

There it is, clear and unequivocal—an open-ended offer to talk peace. So far there has been no definitive response. If there be none at all, then it may be days and months and years, but: "We shall stay as long as aggression commands us to battle." We shall not abandon Asia to conquest.

The mailed fist and the hand of friendship at the same time, the warning we'll see it through whatever the cost, yet the offer also of aid to all Vietnamese, North and South. Here was compassion and determination, resolve without riproaring threats. It was the true voice of America, the world heard last night.

War on Poverty Allocated \$8 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, a reporter, Margaret Josten, of the Cincinnati Enquirer, has written a seven-part series on the antipoverty program in Cincinnati. Today, I include the fourth part of her series to illustrate the kind of reporting that helps inform the public about the various antipoverty programs at work in our communities under the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

WAR ON POVERTY ALLOCATED \$8 MILLION

(By Margaret Josten)

It costs about \$8 million to buy a 707 jet or to build a significant stretch of expressway through an urban area.

February 7, 1966

Warring on poverty is expensive business too—if the approximately \$8 million (90 percent Federal, 10 percent local) allocated in the Cincinnati area since January 1965 is any indication of what it will cost before the big job is done.

Explaining the reasons for the cost of the war on poverty has been and probably will remain a major chore of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, as well as for John E. Hansan, executive director of the Community Action Commission, local arm of the operation.

HOW MANY BENEFIT?

How many of the poor are actually getting benefits?

Can the cost (the current appropriation for the entire United States is \$1.5 billion) be related to the effect?

The second question is the most difficult to answer at this stage of the war. Even in Cincinnati, far ahead of cities which have been plagued by political bickering, the effort is mostly in a stage of mobilization.

Dr. Joseph Kershaw, formerly of the Rand Corp., now OEO's director of planning and evaluation, currently is computing the cost-effect on nine major battlefronts.

This cannot be done overnight, he says, principally because the programs are so new they have yet to show output.

MUST FOLLOW UP

To compute the effectiveness of the Job Corps, for instance, he will have to follow graduates into jobs.

Did the teenagers in the Neighborhood Youth Corps actually finish high school or did they get jobs on the open market? Did the children in Operation Head Start really get enough help to overcome environments considered detrimental to learning?

Some of these questions, he adds, may not be answerable for a generation.

Bringing the cost-effect question to Cincinnati in connection with its \$8 million in projects is just as difficult. Speculation is easier here, however.

It is no secret that Cincinnati's civil rights leaders and city officials had some uneasy moments in the wake of Los Angeles riots which cost 34 lives and millions in property damage.

Mr. Hansan observes that Los Angeles had no antipoverty program at the time, while Cincinnati did. Neither he nor anybody else can say this was the reason or even one of the reasons trouble never erupted here.

NYC WORKED 3,000

But he does point out that 3,000 young persons in the critical 16-to-21 age group, generally from slum families, were employed in the Neighborhood Youth Corps at the time. To have gotten into trouble would have cost them their \$1.25-an-hour jobs.

Then, too, community centers were operating in the slum neighborhoods. Adults, teenagers, and children were getting aid ranging from remedial reading to recreation to job counseling. Mr. Hansan says they were at least being shown that somebody outside the ghetto cared—which was hardly the case in Los Angeles.

Of the \$8 million allocated to Cincinnati, about \$4 million has been spent.

Mr. Hansan points out that the bulk of that money is being paid out in wages to people who have many material needs. It is not setting in savings accounts, he says. Rather it is going to department stores, insurance agents, grocers, shoe repairmen, landlords.

"It is only reasonable to expect these expenditures have a rippling effect throughout the entire metropolitan community in the form of expanded business," he adds.

BENEFITING THE POOR

How many of the poor are really benefiting from the antipoverty program here?

First, unlike the custom in some cities, the

poor of Cincinnati are given a voice in policymaking.

Each neighborhood project has a resident board of directors which sends a representative to the metropolitan community action board where, as Mr. Hansan says, "You've got to be poor to belong." At MCAB four persons are elected to serve on the governing body of the community action commission.

There, in practice as well as theory, the people from the poverty pockets have the same voice as the representatives from the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce or the AFL-CIO Labor Council of Cincinnati.

They have shown, too, that the social sophistication of the poor is sometimes underrated. Take as an example the little speech a new representative made when she introduced herself and the three others at a recent CAC session.

She pointed: "He has a black face. She has a white face. She has a brown face. And I have a freckled face."

WEST END PROJECT

The West End Special Services Project, operating under sponsorship of Seven Hills Neighborhood Houses, Inc., is a good example of the number of poor getting employment out of an antipoverty program.

Of 72 employees, 65 are residents of the West End. Eight are Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees receiving \$1.25 an hour. The other residents on the payroll are older persons getting either \$1.25 or \$1.50 for their efforts as neighborhood organizers or program aids.

The project has directly or indirectly reached approximately 27,353 residents of an area still considered the prime example of deprivation in Cincinnati.

Mr. Hansan says essentially the same ratios of professional to nonprofessional employees exist in other neighborhood projects.

MORE THAN MONEY

"The poverty we're trying to eliminate is not just poverty of the purse," Mrs. Hansan reminds.

"It's poverty of opportunity to enjoy the recognition of status and respect that comes from serving on boards and committees working for the public good.

"Even though they are poor they have as much desire to give of themselves as businessmen or professional people.

"What we are trying to do is to open the doors to them—to let them share the same opportunities as others."

Increased Federal Control Sought in Unemployment Compensation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, members of the Alabama delegation were privileged to listen to a thoughtful report on H.R. 8282, unemployment compensation, at the recent meeting of the Associated Industries of Alabama. I would like to share with all the Members the thoughts contained in this report by Mr. Hubert T. Sullivan, director of industrial relations, Opp Cotton Mills, Opp, Ala.

STATEMENT IN THE EMPLOYEE BENEFITS FIELD, PRESENTED BEFORE THE ALABAMA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, JANUARY 24, 1966

(By Hubert T. Sullivan)

Subject: H.R. 8282, unemployment compensation.

President Lem, member of the Alabama congressional delegation, and my fellow representatives of Alabama business and industry, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to say a few words in regard to the attempts that are being made by the administration to overhaul and completely modernize the so-called antiquated unemployment compensation systems of the various States.

You are familiar with the administration bill, H.R. 8282, which has been introduced and on which hearings have been completed by the Ways and Means Committee. The administration with the full backing of labor, is attempting to sell this bill as a modernization program, claiming that the program has not been overhauled in a good many years.

This is simply not true—the unemployment program is constantly being modernized and overhauled. Nearly every session of the various State legislatures make some changes in their unemployment compensation laws to meet changing economic conditions or to solve some problem peculiar to their State. The overwhelming majority of the changes are in the nature of increased benefits or other liberalization of the program.

During the year 1965 alone, 30 States (including Alabama) increased their weekly benefit amount. All but two States provide for at least 26 weeks of coverage. During 1965, four States increased their tax base over the \$3,000 floor provided in the Federal act. This brings to 18 the number of States with tax base in excess of \$3,000. Maximum tax rates were increased in eight States during 1965. Thirty-seven States have UC taxes above the required 2.7-percent rate.

A fair test to measure Federal legislation affecting socioeconomic legislative programs of the various States should be whether the proposed Federal legislation is designed to preserve and foster an environment in which the States themselves determine how best to balance change with stability and how best to tailor the programs to meet the needs and situations of the people of the various States.

Instead of preserving the existing systems of State unemployment programs which have kept pace with economic and other changes, H.R. 8282 seeks to displace, if not demolish, the State systems by substituting a centralized Federal system operating out of Washington, under the Department of Labor, which superimposes its own predetermined blanket requirements upon all States alike, the richest, the poorest, the largest, and the smallest, the most industrial, and the most agricultural. Does this meet the "test" outlined above? Absolutely not.

The present unemployment compensation program has furnished us one of the finest, if not the finest, example of Federal-State cooperation that we have.

In Alabama, our unemployment compensation program has operated most efficiently under the direction of the Alabama Department of Industrial Relations. Scarcely a session of the legislature passes without the enactment of improvements in the Alabama law. For the most part, these improvements are worked out between employer and labor groups in cooperation with the State agency and are presented to the legislature as "agreed" legislation. In this way, the law is kept up to date and meets the needs for which it was created. Several minor crises have threatened and have been overcome.

As an example, in 1961, the trust fund had declined from a high of \$85 million to a low of \$44 million. A bill was rushed through the legislature which not only increased benefits and made other liberalizations in the law, but which imposed a higher tax on employers—with the result that the trust fund has built up to approximately \$90 million at the present time. This trust fund balance represents 5.23 percent of the total taxable wages for 1964. Even with these improvements, the average tax on Alabama em-

strengthen our American educational resources for international studies and research. But, this intention, itself, is based upon other convictions about the purposes of legislation concerning international education. Fundamentally, we are committed to the study of other nations because we believe nations are more inclined to cooperate if they know and understand each other. This seems like commonsense to me.

Furthermore, it is appropriate for the Federal Government of a prosperous Nation to initiate this work among the nations by taking the work upon itself—on one hand perhaps only to assist the development of resources for international study at home; but, on the other, also to assist the progress of education in the developing nations.

We believe in this country that our citizens should relate to other countries from a position of educational strength. And we also believe in full opportunity for all Americans to acquire the fullest possible knowledge of other nations, peoples, and cultures.

More specifically, the International Education Act of 1966 intends to strengthen American educational resources for international study and research by setting up a grant program under the authority of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Our resources in this area would be strengthened in two ways.

Under section 3 of the act, grants may be made to institutions of higher education in order to establish, strengthen, and operate graduate centers, which will serve as national and international resources, for research and training in international studies. These graduate centers would be free to focus either on specific geographic areas, or on particular issues in international affairs.

Under section 4 of this act, grants would be made to institutions of higher learning to assist them in the planning developing and executing of a comprehensive program to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies. The grants would be used for a variety of activities, such as: facility planning of undergraduate courses; training faculty members in a foreign country; expanding foreign language courses; working in other fields related to international studies; student work-study-travel programs; for visiting faculty of foreign teachers and scholars.

The appealing feature about the assistance given to undergraduate schools is the fact that these grants are made both in an effort toward equitable distribution throughout the States, and with preference given to institutions showing need as well as promise in international studies.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to utilize other governmental services and facilities—section 5. No Federal Department or employee is in any way authorized to exert influence over curriculum, teaching, administration, or personnel of the educational institutions receiving grants—section 6.

The bill authorizes the grant program for the duration of 5 years—section 7. Finally, one section of this bill improves

title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended, by expanding the language and area centers' program.

Mr. Speaker, with 4 out of every 10 of the world's adults unable to read or write, with large sections of some countries having an illiteracy rate of 98 percent, a total commitment to the cause of universal learning is no doubt our most constructive instrument of world citizenship.

The New York Times recently ran an outstanding editorial dealing with the subject of international education. I quote:

Domestic educational strength is indivisible from success overseas. Shortages of highly educated, competent and committed manpower at home will continue to jeopardize the American impact in other lands.

In his message on international education, President Johnson has reminded us of the inescapable connection of learning and freedom. He said men pursued knowledge no matter what the consequences, that the increase of learning was the first work of a nation that wants to be free, that is what this bill would help bring about.

It has been said that "education is power."

It is the power to transform. To change. Through such legislation, I feel the United States will eventually be able to strike a mighty blow against the chains which enslave millions around the globe in misery, ignorance, and disease.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ACT OF 1966

(Mr. GIBBONS (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill to establish a National Highway Traffic Safety Agency in the U.S. Department of Commerce. The purpose of this legislation is to attack our country's mounting highway death rate from a national perspective.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman JAMES A. MACKAY, has taken the lead in this fight in the House of Representatives, as today he introduced legislation of this nature. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] and urge quick action on this legislation, for surely it is needed to help stop the terrible carnage on our highways.

Mr. Speaker, 1,284 of our fellow Americans lost their lives on the Christmas and New Year weekends. No, they did not die fighting in South Vietnam. They died right here in the United States of America on our streets and highways.

Traffic accidents cost this Nation a great price. Last year, it has been estimated that some 50,000 individuals lost their lives on our roads and highways. This figure represents a greater number of deaths than this country suffered in the Korean war and is a substantial percentage of our World War II casualties. Besides these shocking figures, total financial loss suffered every year from highway accidents of all types runs up

to \$9 billion. That is one-fourth of the total expenditures of the United States on all forms of education.

The President of the United States in a speech recently before the American Trial Lawyers Association said the gravest "problem before this Nation—next to the war in Vietnam is the death and destruction" from auto accidents.

The legislation which I introduce today will establish in the Commerce Department a National Highway Traffic Safety Agency and center for research into methods of more effectively attacking this problem which most certainly is a national one.

Through this Agency, national leadership would be available through joint cooperative State and local campaigns and the assistance of the American auto industry so that drastic cuts can be brought about in our staggering highway fatality statistics.

Such an agency in the Commerce Department would give overall direction and assistance to highway safety efforts now made by 16 existing Federal agencies and some 45 private agencies. It is the thought of Congressman MACKAY, and I would agree with him, that such a National Highway Traffic Safety Agency would be to highway safety much as the Federal Aviation Agency is to air traffic safety. This makes a lot of sense to me.

This would be no Federal police force. This would be a fact-finding, research organization which would help our local, State, and other governmental bodies in the formulation of adequate safety requirements for automobiles and driving standards throughout the country. I agree with Congressman MACKAY that this legislation is overdue and needed now. I urge its swift consideration by this Congress.

(Mr. McGRATH (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. McGRATH'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HELSTOSKI'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE VIETNAM DECISION

(Mr. HANSEN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, watching President Johnson make his dramatic announcement about resumption of North Vietnam bomb raids, millions of TV viewers saw in the background the symbolic American eagle, clutching in one set of claws the arrows of war, and in the other the olive branch of peace.

power might well be justified. But though it is not without the bounds of possibility that the increased use of some armed protective force may yet be necessary, I believe that other measures are still available.

The State Department has worked at length to find such a solution but their methods of persuasion and argument have often proved unavailing. The nations concerned—Chile, Ecuador, Peru, and now Colombia—have seemed immune to argument and persuasion. In the absence of firm worldwide law, none has been willing to make an agreement on the basis of generally accepted practices.

The time has come for a consideration of methods stronger than mere persuasion, methods that will serve to convince every nation that while the United States will scrupulously regard the rights of others on the high seas, we will insist that others give equal regard to our own rights.

The time has come to make it clear to all nations that we will protect the rights and freedoms of our citizens wherever they may be engaged in lawful activities on the high seas, and that this protection will be extended by whatever means that may become necessary.

If this determination is made known, and this resolve becomes clear, it is my hope that nations which have been harassing our fishing vessels, and nations which might be tempted to do so, will instead be inclined to accept our repeated invitation to "come, let us reason together." From such reasoning alone can come the international agreements needed to forestall the strife that may well lie ahead without them.

(Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FEIGHAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE CONSTRUCTIVE TEENAGERS

(Mr. CRALEY (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, we hear and read a great deal these days about juvenile delinquents, vandalism by teenagers, and other sordid acts by youngsters in the Nation.

Because of the destructive nature of such actions, too often little attention is given to the constructive acts and accomplishments of the vast majority of the teenagers who are laying the foundations of their futures as responsible citizens.

I have in my district a very outstanding young man who, I believe, epitomizes the responsible teenagers. He is Ronald H. Boggs, of Carlisle, Pa., who was selected as one of the 14 representatives of the 5,600,000 Boy Scouts of America who will make the annual "Report to the Nation" to President Johnson on February 9 of this year.

The 14 boys making the report were selected on a competitive basis which took into account school, church, community, and scouting records.

Ronald is 17 years old and attends Carlisle High School where he is on the honor roll, a member of weight lifting, speech, art, chess, and science clubs. He holds two letters in music and has participated in the Boys Glee Club and the high school chorus.

Among the scouting awards he has won are the Bronze and Gold Palm Eagle, 15 Miler Award, God and Country Award, and Order of Arrow. In addition to scouting, he is interested in science and has received two science awards, one by the Institute of Radio Engineers and another by the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers.

I am sure his parents, Col. and Mrs. William H. Boggs are very proud of him. I commend him for his outstanding achievements and am most happy to have such a well-rounded, outstanding young citizen in the 19th District of Pennsylvania.

(Mr. MINISH (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MINISH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

(Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a House concurrent resolution commemorating the Boy Scouts of America, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the granting of its charter.

During the 50 years that this organization has been in existence, it has fostered in our youth the highest of ideals; it has promoted the manly qualities of self-reliance, endurance, and physical fitness; and it has developed honesty, integrity, and leadership in the youth of our Nation.

I have been a Boy Scout myself and have continued to take an active interest in scouting activities. Both of my sons

were also active in scouting work.

I introduce this resolution to appropriately recognize this memorable year because of my belief in the ideals and principles for which the Boy Scouts of America stands.

I hope that this resolution will be favorably considered by the House of Representatives and approved.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

(Mr. GIBBONS (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce a bill to implement provisions of the President's message to the Congress on international education.

This bill would be the International Education Act of 1966.

I support the President in his call for this action because it is consistent with the present administration's objectives, both for educational citizenship within the Nation, and for the Nation's responsible citizenship within a larger world. A world which continues to shrink every day.

We have long been aware of the importance of educating the American public for responsible citizenship in our own country. In a 1957 speech, our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy, whom the people of my city of Tampa loved so much, when he was a Member of the Senate reaffirmed the positive relationship which exists between education and public responsibility.

President Kennedy said every man on the street was a citizen.

Every man was a citizen "who held office"; every citizen held office, as Abraham Lincoln had said, by virtue of the vote and opinion with which he made statutes either possible or impossible to execute.

Moreover, President Kennedy acknowledged how some citizens were slow and shortsighted; but the remedy to provincial opinions, according to Thomas Jefferson, rests not in removing, but in informing the citizen's "discretion and control."

With the demands of responsible citizenship so clearly unavoidable, then, Senator Kennedy said that young Americans ought to be educated for playing an active and informed role in the political affairs of the Nation.

The President of the United States in his February 2 message to the Congress and the American people, suggested that we not limit to our own shores our battle with ignorance and disease. This is the cause, the world task, he pointed out, that we may commit ourselves to by passing the International Education Act of 1966.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, and as one deeply committed to our fight against poverty and ignorance at home, I wholeheartedly support President Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I introduce today will help to increase the dimensions of American citizenship. This is my hope and my earnest desire.

The single intention of my bill is to

It is perhaps important for us to remember that the eagle looks toward peace—while having all of the arrows of war which he needs at his ready disposal.

Praising the stand taken by this administration, Newsday said that the decision of the President "reflects well on the system and on the man." It adds:

For the President did not merely resume a military operation; he put fresh impetus into the search for a peaceful conclusion by directing that the Vietnam struggle be brought before the United Nations Security Council.

The newspaper feels that the request demonstrates:

Two fundamentals of our Vietnam policy: that we will honor our commitments to protect South Vietnam from aggression and that we will seek all means to move the issue from the battlefield to the conference table.

I commend this editorial for the perusal of my colleagues, and with their permission I submit it for the RECORD.

[From Newsday, Feb. 1, 1966]

THE VIETNAM DECISION

Seldom has the loneliness of the man in the White House been more apparent than in the past several weeks. President Johnson's decision to end the 87-day pause in the bombing of North Vietnam was subjected to the harsh discipline of the Presidency and it did not come easily. Many could advise and inform, but the President, ever conscious of his awesome responsibility, had to make the final choice himself. We think his decision reflects well on the system and on the man. For the President did not merely resume a military operation; he put fresh impetus into the search for a peaceful conclusion by directing that the Vietnam struggle be brought before the United Nations Security Council. His request demonstrates anew President Johnson's determination to adhere to the two fundamentals of our Vietnam policy; that we will honor our commitment to protect South Vietnam from aggression and that we will seek all means to move the issue from the battlefield to the conference table.

The President has now forcefully and dramatically answered both the foreign and domestic critics of his Vietnam policy. Hanoi had 87 days to respond favorably to the pause in bombing. But the only response was negative, coupled with a demand for total victory on Hanoi's own terms. Moreover, the U.S. pause in bombing produced only continued Communist infiltration, continued terrorism in South Vietnam, continued insistence on terms utterly detached from reality and, of course, continued invective.

The renewed use of air power in the north again will be controlled, as it had been, with great care and aimed only at military targets. The resumption serves two purposes, one military and the other diplomatic. The military purpose is obvious. The bombing will attempt to destroy the troops and supplies being infiltrated from the north. The diplomatic purpose should be just as obvious. It is a warning to Hanoi and Peking that the United States is not prepared to abandon South Vietnam to the Vietcong.

TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The decision to bring the Vietnam impasse to the U.N. Security Council is as significant as the decision to resume bombing. During the pause, the quiet diplomacy of President Johnson's peace offensive saw six envoys visit 34 countries. The President is now bringing his case to the world forum in another mode of diplomacy at a moment when the pause in bombing and the President's peace offensive are fresh exhibits before the court of world opinion.

The Security Council, of course, is powerless without great power agreement. The President's initiative in that council, therefore, may not open the door to negotiations. But the Security Council is an organ of the organization that has become the diplomatic home of the neutral nations. Pope Paul VI has suggested that the neutral nations be used to arbitrate the impasse in Vietnam. And yesterday Secretary of State Rusk said the United States would suggest to the Security Council the role that neutral nations could play in opening the way to the conference table. If neutral participation can bring about a solution, the U.N. is the arena in which to seek it.

The move to the U.N. is an expansion of the President's peace offensive. It is another demonstration of the desire of the United States to substitute diplomacy for military action. The bombing is a controlled resumption of the air war; the Security Council initiative is an escalation of the peace effort.

We think the decision represents a wise mixture. The President is entitled to the full support of all Americans.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

(Mr. HANSEN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the request of the President for authority for the United States to participate in the Asian Development Bank should be greeted with quick approval by the Congress.

Under H.R. 12563, our participation is authorized with a share of \$100 million in direct capital and an additional \$100 million in callable shares. This will be 20 percent of the bank's total capitalization of \$1 billion. Our contribution would equal that given by Japan.

This is one of the most creative proposals made for the trouble ridden nations of southeast Asia. It will make possible the building of roads, dams, powerplants, harbors, and other facilities essential to a modern economy. The lack of these facilities has been a major factor in the poverty and tragedy that has made the foment of internal dissension possible.

Just as was the case in the Americas a decade or so ago, the nations of southeast Asia have come to realize that adequate fiscal resources are a basic requirement for peace and prosperity. The ability to transfer these resources to areas of great need has also been lacking. Through the Asian Development Bank this mobility can be achieved and it will bring greater stability and an opportunity to develop the peaceful pursuits within the nations of the entire region.

All of us have felt that more should be done in Vietnam than assist in re-establishing peace. The stability brought about by the Asian Development Bank will do much to meet the needs of Vietnam. Further, it will bring about circumstances that will assist in stemming the spread of Communist ideology. Not only will this help Vietnam, but it will materially lessen for the United States the need for maintaining troop concentrations in Vietnam.

The need for the Asian Development Bank has been demonstrated. I urge my colleagues to give this bill their full support.

(Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BOLAND'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE COST OF HIGHER INTEREST RATES

(Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, last week President Johnson sent up to Congress his economic report, and presently this report is receiving thorough and careful study by the Joint Economic Committee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN.

Our productive and ever growing economy and the effects that the conflict in Vietnam are causing to it, is reason for intensive study. Our Republican colleagues are demanding great cutbacks in vital domestic programs so as to offset the budgetary requirements for Vietnam. Yet, next to our national defense needs, the item that has grown the most in this budget is the amount paid on our debt.

Due to the tighter money policies of the Federal Reserve and its decision last December to raise the discount rate and regulation Q, the cost of borrowing for both the public and the Government has increased substantially.

A recent editorial by Bob Cronin in the Rural Electric Minuteman, a publication of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, discusses the great increases in our public debt due to higher interest rates. The chairman of our Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas, is quoted in this editorial on the Fed's irresponsible action and their responsibility for the higher costs to the taxpayer. Perhaps if our Republican colleagues would take time to study the effects that higher interest rates have on our economy, they might find that this might be an area to cut back increased spending.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the editorial "The Interest Rate Caper: How It Happened" follow my remarks.

[From the Rural Electric Minuteman, Jan. 28, 1966]

THE INTEREST RATE CAPER: HOW IT HAPPENED

Anyone who doubted the effect that last December's actions by the Federal Reserve Board would have on the Nation's economy will be interested in an item contained in the President's new budget proposal, announced to Congress this week.

This is the estimate of an increase of \$654 million in the cost of interest the Federal Government must pay in fiscal 1967 on the national debt. The total interest bill will therefore jump to nearly \$13 billion.

A number of seasoned Congressmen and economists trace the huge increase in interest

costs directly to the action taken last December by the Federal Reserve Board when it raised the discount rate on loans to member banks and increased the maximum rate the banks may pay on certificates of deposit.

By a curious coincidence, the amount of the estimated increase in the cost of interest charges on the national debt is nearly the amount an NRECA survey found would be needed for the REA electric loan fund in fiscal 1967. Thus, if the Federal Reserve Board had not acted so rashly, this amount of money would have been available without affecting other budgetary demands.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas, whose longtime criticism of the Federal Reserve's high interest, tight money policies has finally stirred up more of his colleagues, had some further comments on the matter this week. Here is what he told Congress, in part, on January 25:

"The interest war is putting a heavy pressure on all Government credit programs. One interest rate leaps over another interest rate and then on and on we go. The consumer, who must ultimately pay all of these increased costs, sits on the sidelines powerless to act in his own behalf.

"It is we, as Members of Congress, who have a solemn duty to provide protection for the public in this vital area. If we fail, we are certain to see pressures for even higher interest rates. And who doubts that the Federal Reserve Board will give in as quickly to these new requests as they did in December.

"The facts are there in black and white. A small number of big banks were holding about \$16½ billion in certificates of deposits on December 3 when the Federal Reserve Board acted. The great majority of these certificates were coming due in December, January, February, and March. The banks desperately wanted to hold on to these deposits.

"To do this, the banks had to have higher interest rates. Otherwise, the corporations would have pulled out the funds and invested in other securities which were paying higher interest rates created by the Federal Reserve Board's tight money policies which has been created and continued throughout 1965. For example, 91-day Treasury bills had been pushed above 4½ percent and as a result were becoming more attractive than certificates of deposit.

"So these big banks were desperate to leapfrog the interest rates and thus hang onto the certificates of deposit. Remember, about 75 percent of the \$16½-billion of certificates of deposit were being held by just 30 big banks.

"On December 2, the pressure reached the boiling point. That afternoon, the Federal Reserve Banks of New York—at 4:01 p.m.—and Chicago—at 4:20 p.m.—suddenly sent identical telegrams to the Federal Reserve Board in Washington demanding an increase in interest rates. Without question, these two banks were speaking for the huge financial institutions residing in those two cities and who had the great majority of the certificates of deposit.

"With almost automatic reaction to the desires of these two financial centers, the Federal Reserve Board—within 24 hours—acted in accordance with the identical telegrams."

PATMAN pointed out that the increase in the discount rate represented a hike of 12½ percent in the wholesale cost of money and a probable retail increase—the consumers' cost—of at least 25 percent.

"All of these increases are huge by anyone's mathematics or economics. Imagine the hue and cry if any union or any industry—other than banking—had attempted to raise its prices by a similar percentage. What would this have done to the wage-price guidelines?"

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE DR. PURNENDU KUMAR BANERJEE, MINISTER, EMBASSY OF INDIA, BEFORE THE DELAWARE CHAPTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a significant speech by the Honorable Dr. Purnendu Kumar Banerjee, Minister, Embassy of India, before the Delaware Chapter of the United Nations Association of the United States.

The text of the speech follows:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION YEAR AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(Address by the Honorable Dr. Purnendu Kumar Banerjee, Minister, Embassy of India, Washington, Before the Delaware Chapter of the United Nations Association of the United States of America, Wilmington, Del.)

It is a privilege and a pleasure to address this erudite and august audience. I wish to share with you a few thoughts on an issue which is not esoteric but inspiring—the International Cooperation Year and the United Nations. You may recall that this concept was originally propounded by the late Indian Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, when he addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1961. In emphasizing the need for promoting the cause of cooperation, he said: "We live in a world of conflict and yet the world goes on, undoubtedly because of the cooperation of nations and individuals * * * even today, between countries which are opposed to each other in the political and other fields, there is a vast amount of cooperation. Little is known or little is said about this cooperation that is going on and a great deal is said about every point of conflict, and so the world is full of this idea that the conflicts go on and we live on the verge of disaster. Perhaps, it would be a truer picture if the cooperating elements in the world today were put forward and we were made to think that the world depends on cooperation and not on conflict."

The United Nations commended this proposition. In declaring 1965 as the International Cooperation Year, the General Assembly accepted "wider and more intensive international cooperation" as one of the most "effective means of dispensing international tensions." President Johnson, while proclaiming the International Cooperation Year, went further to add that it is "not an idea nor an ideal. We think it is a clear necessity for our survival. The greater the nation, the greater is its need to work cooperatively with other people, with other countries, with other nations."

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri also underlined the need for united effort and emphasized that international cooperation is the only means "to rid the world of the ancient ills of hunger, ignorance, and disease, of the new terror of the nuclear holocaust." This concurrence of views, on the International Cooperation Year, is based on a conviction that cooperation is not a corollary but the core of coexistence, which is the only alternative to coextinction.

The conceptual framework that focuses our viewpoint to cooperation rests on the premise that there is a clear need for shifting the positive factors in the life of the world community and placing them prominently on a pedestal. In other words, mankind could profitably stress that which is

common rather than uncommon, what unites us rather than what divides us. This would be possible if we accept and applaud the existing and emerging international community and uphold the need for tolerance.

To take the latter first, the idea of tolerance based on mutual respect comes to Indians quite naturally. From Buddha to Gandhi, the idea of cooperation and coexistence has permeated our ethos and has formed a powerful link in forging the unity of India. India too, like the United States, is a land of diversity. It has developed a multiracial and multireligious society. More by choice than by compulsion, India, has nourished and nurtured through centuries a composite culture wherein differing ideas and ideologies could live together peacefully. It is no wonder, as Arnold Toynbee described, that "the Indian missionaries of an Indian philosophy, Buddhism, were the first people in history to think and feel in terms of human race as a whole. They felt a concern for all their fellow human beings; they had a vision of mankind as being potentially a single family and they set themselves to turn this potential unity into an accomplished fact by peaceful persuasion."

Wisdom, not sword, was their weapon. They believed, like the Indian Emperor Asoka, in the great principle that "concord alone is meritorious." This idea has always acted as a beacon to the Indian people.

Though this concept of unity of humanity has been with us almost since the dawn of history, it received public acclaim only 20 years ago. The Charter of the United Nations opens with the most significant phrase "We the peoples of the United Nations * * *". The charter was not a document negotiated by "The high contracting parties." It must be admitted that along with the charter, the concept of world community gained belated recognition. There was in 1945, a great concern that we were already too late in dismantling the walls that vertically divided the world based on unbridled and uncompromising territorial sovereignty. Before long, this oneness of humanity became a historic and political fact.

A million factors have made this possible. Primarily, science and technology were making the nations interdependent and interconnected irrespective of their political attitude. The liquidation of distance has altered the rhythm of life. Science has broken the artificial barriers. Art and culture have come to be common links between peoples and nations. The isolated existence of human groups has become outdated and even impossible. The tools, ideas and media of communications available to man have generated a historical process that has unified the world.

In many matters of our daily life, there is a direct impact of cooperation through international organizations such as the World Meteorological Organization, which has established a worldwide weather reporting system; the International Atomic Energy Agency, which oversees the peaceful use of atomic energy; the aerial navigation supervised by the International Civil Aviation Organization; the frequency allocations of broadcasts controlled by the International Communication Union; and the maritime regulations instituted by the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization—to mention a few. The United States, for example, participates in more than 600 international conferences annually and has nearly 4,300 treaties and agreements to honor. It is, therefore, dangerous and harmful to seek to split this technologically and sociologically unified world into isolated compartments of the past. As Whyte (in his book "The Next Development of Man") put it, "the separation of East and West is

4. Harvest productivity per man-hour sunk substantially.

5. Prices of fresh and canned asparagus in grocery stores skyrocketed and substantially broke the administration's so-called maximum guidelines of 3.2 percent. This penalized the housewife. Nevertheless, you didn't hear the administration make the usual threats of retaliatory action which it did with proposed steel, copper, and aluminum price increases. The administration must have had a guilty conscience since it was primarily responsible for the increases.

6. The number of illegal Mexican "wet-backs" who came into the United States completely illegally to obtain temporary farm jobs doubled during the year.

7. In the meantime, the administration repeatedly discriminated against California and in favor of Florida by being more liberal in allowing West Indians to come into Florida to work in harvest fields at rates substantially lower than those it set for California.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, having followed for some months the question of free world shipping to North Vietnam and reported from time to time to my colleagues, I should like to take this opportunity to present a status report concerning activities during the past year.

In 1965 there were more free world ships than Communist ships engaged in carrying goods to and from North Vietnam. Unfortunately, I cannot disclose the exact figures of this traffic, because they are classified, but I invite any and every interested Member to examine them closely. I know there are many who are concerned about this phase of the war and already have expressed themselves this session.

Before presenting what information I can about the nature and extension of free world shipping into North Vietnam, I am aware that some may justifiably wonder why any of this information should be classified. It certainly is no secret to Ho Chi Minh. One reason, I am told, is that to reveal such data might place in jeopardy our own sources of information. No one, of course, wishes to hamper our intelligence network. However, I am satisfied that a great deal more of this information can and should be made public. When American boys are dying from North Vietnamese bullets, the American people have a right to adequate information about who is aiding the enemy. As it stands now, and as it stood throughout 1965, the American people simply have not been told the whole truth about the shocking support being given by free world ships to a nation blatantly engaged in Communist aggression and subversion.

The unclassified data that is made available to me by the Department of Defense indicates that while there has been some reduction in the volume of this trade in 1965 over that of 1964, a dis-

turbing amount persists. At this point in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to include an itemization by month of arrivals of free world ships in North Vietnam during 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MINISH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHART A.—Free world ships arriving North Vietnam—Continued

JANUARY 1965				
Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived	
Aiolos II	Lebanese	7,256	Jan. 26	
Cardross	British	2,314	Jan. 29	
Elbow River	do.	5,179	Jan. 7	
Golden Zeta	do.	4,474	Do.	
Hakuyo Maru	Japanese	6,430	Jan. 9	
Jinsan	British	1,261	Jan. 1	
Do.	do.	1,261	Jan. 10	
Do.	do.	1,261	Jan. 17	
Do.	do.	1,261	Jan. 25	
Langford	do.	2,865	Jan. 1	
Panagos	Lebanese	7,133	Jan. 28	
Saronis	Greek	7,271	Jan. 25	
Santa Granda	British	7,229	Jan. 21	
Wakasa Bay	do.	7,040	Jan. 16	

FEBRUARY 1965				
Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived	
Bidford	British	2,865	Feb. 5	
Cardamitis	Greek	7,163	Feb. 7	
Cardross	British	2,314	Feb. 15	
Dartford	do.	2,739	Feb. 7	
Elbow River	do.	5,179	Feb. 17	
Fortune Wind	do.	3,376	Feb. 15	
Jinsan	do.	1,261	Feb. 1	
Do.	do.	1,261	Feb. 14	
Do.	do.	1,261	Feb. 23	
Do.	do.	1,261	Feb. 28	
Longford	do.	2,865	Feb. 23	
Melwa Maru	Japanese	4,975	Feb. 15	
Newglade	British	7,368	Feb. 11	
Rochford	do.	3,324	Feb. 20	
Stanwear	do.	8,108	Feb. 23	
Syros	Greek	7,176	Feb. 7	
Wakasa Bay	British	7,040	Feb. 7	
Wishford	do.	3,464	Feb. 27	

MARCH 1965				
Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived	
Bidford	British	2,865	Mar. 5	
Cardross	do.	2,314	Mar. 4	
Dukat	Norwegian	1,401	Mar. 2	
Do.	do.	1,401	Mar. 15	
Elbow River	British	5,179	Mar. 4	
Golden Alpha	do.	6,031	Mar. 7	
Hollands Diep	Dutch	9,631	Mar. 31	
Longford	British	2,865	Mar. 27	
Nissos Paros	Greek	1,853	Mar. 4	
Rahiotis	do.	7,133	Mar. 23	
Sambas	Dutch	1,874	Mar. 14	
Do.	do.	1,874	Mar. 25	
Santa Granda	British	7,229	Mar. 27	
San Spyridon	Lebanese	7,260	Mar. 13	

APRIL 1965				
Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived	
Grecian Isles	Greek	9,173	Apr. 23	
Mui Hong	Norwegian	1,398	Apr. 29	
Santa Granda	British	7,229	Apr. —	
Stetford	Norwegian	1,705	Apr. 4	
Do.	do.	1,705	Apr. 13	

MAY 1965				
Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived	
Antarctica	British	8,785	May 21	
Cardross	do.	2,313	May 5	
Do.	do.	2,313	May 29	
Fortune Wind	do.	3,376	May 6	
Gisna	Norwegian	6,030	May 5	
Do.	do.	6,030	May 29	
Herborg	do.	3,312	May 21	
Irena	Greek	7,232	Do.	
Kawana	British	7,308	May 27	
Nancy Dee	do.	6,547	May 31	
Nymfca	Greek	7,276	May 1	
Phoevos	do.	9,949	May 16	
Shirley Christine	British	6,724	May 30	
Stetford	Norwegian	1,705	May 6	
Yanxilas	Lebanese	10,051	May 3	

JUNE 1965				
Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived	
Avisfaith	British	7,868	June 7	
Alkon	Greek	7,150	June 6	
Cardross	British	2,313	June 28	
Helena	Norwegian	2,529	June 21	
Kyvernitis	Greek	9,360	June 1	
Newheath	British	6,391	June 11	
Newmoat	do.	7,151	June 29	
Phoenix Dawn	do.	8,708	June 13	
Strevill	Greek	7,181	June 5	

JULY 1965				
Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived	
Agios Therapon	Greek	5,617	July 11	
Agenor	do.	7,199	July 6	
Arrossmore	do.	5,820	July 24	
Alkon	Greek	7,150	July —	
Fortune Wind	British	3,376	July 6	
Hellas	Greek	7,176	July 11	
Herborg	Norwegian	3,321	July 9	
Shenfool	British	7,127	July 1	
Shirley Christine	do.	6,724	Do.	

AUGUST 1965				
Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived	
Amalia	Maltese	7,304	Aug. 28	
Helena	Norway	2,529	Aug. 8	
Herborg	do.	3,321	Aug. 2	
Do.	do.	3,321	Aug. 28	
Willowpool	British	8,972	Aug. 30	

SEPTEMBER 1965				
Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived	
Fortune Wind	British	3,376	Sept. 27	
Helena	Norwegian	2,529	Sept. 4	
Herborg	do.	3,321	Sept. 22	
Jessellon Bay	British	7,189	Sept. 7	
Stanwear	do.	8,108	Sept. 23	

OCTOBER 1965				
Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived	
Acme	Cyprus	7,159	Oct. 16	
Arrossmore	British	5,820	Oct. 14	
Bidford	do.	2,865	Oct. —	
Helena	Norwegian	2,529	Oct. 22	
Herborg	do.	3,321	Oct. 15	
Kingford	British	2,911	Oct. 19	
Santa Granda	do.	7,229	Oct. —	

NOVEMBER 1965				
Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived	
Arrossmore	British	5,820	Nov. 26	
Dartford	do.	2,739	Nov. 17	
Fortune Wind	do.	3,376	Nov. 26	
Herborg	Norwegian	3,321	Nov. 9	
Ho Fung	British	7,121	Nov. 10	
Jollity	do.	8,650	Do.	
Kanaris	Greek	7,240	Nov. —	
Longford	British	2,865	Nov. 2	
Starford	do.	3,464	Nov. 12	

DECEMBER 1965				
Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived	
Aktor	Cyprus	6,993	Dec. 12	
Isabel Erica	British	7,105	Dec. 11	
Kanaris	Greek	7,240	Do.	
Newheath	British	6,743	Dec. 2	
Wakasa Bay	do.	7,040	Dec. 12	

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as I reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 22, 1965, during 1964 a total of 401 free world ships arrived in North Vietnam. According to the unclassified figures there were 119 free world ship arrivals in North Vietnam in 1965. Of this 119 figure 107 involved ships flying the flags of NATO countries.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to insert a

February 7, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2299

DOUBLE BENEFIT

UNESCO will find and hire the technicians, but they must be acceptable to Havana. So we may easily see U.S. taxpayer funds giving the Communist world a double benefit. For the experts to be hired will most likely come from Russia and other Iron Curtain countries.

Any assistance to Havana University, especially technical assistance, is direct aid to the central dynamo of the Cuban regime.

Castro officials have specifically declared that students who attend the technical faculties go there not only for technical studies, but to become perfected in Marxist-Leninism.

(Mr. WYDLER (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WYDLER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

HORTON BILL PROVIDES OVERTIME PAY FOR POSTAL SUBSTITUTES FOR WORK IN EXCESS OF 8 HOURS A DAY

(Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last September 30, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 10281, the Government Employees Salary Comparability Act of 1965 by an overwhelming majority, 370 to 7. It was a good bill. It provided increased pay for Government workers, including postal workers, and contained a number of other provisions beneficial to postal workers.

Most of its provisions were retained in the bill after passage by the Senate and as it was finally approved by the President on October 29, 1965 as Public Law 89-301. But the Senate made one change in the final version as passed and which is distinctly unfair and must be promptly rectified.

In the bill as it passed the House, substitute employees in the Post Office Department were entitled to overtime pay for work—

(A) in excess of 8 hours a day or (B) in excess of 40 hours a week.

As the bill passed the Senate and was finally approved, the provision for overtime for substitute postal employees was limited to overtime pay for work in excess of 40 hours a week. The provision for overtime after 8 hours a day was eliminated.

It is this latter provision which would be restored by the bill I am introducing today. It is in the interests of both fairness and efficiency that substitute employees of the post office should be paid overtime not just for work in excess of 40 hours a week, but also for any work in excess of 8 hours in any one day.

Regular employees paid on an hourly rate already are granted overtime in excess of 8 hours a day. In fairness substitute employees should receive no less. It is the substitute employees who are called upon in emergencies and often on

little notice and who, without the protection of this bill, can be called upon to work 12 consecutive hours in 1 day and again on 2 more days during the same week without getting overtime.

My bill would not only put substitute employees on the same footing as regular hourly employees. It would also put the Post Office Department on the same basis as industry generally. Our substitute mail carriers and other postal workers should not be made to suffer a second-class status. They deserve the same consideration as other postal employees because of the uncertainties of their employment and the long hours they are likely to work.

I therefore urge prompt consideration and adoption of my bill.

LOSSES SUFFERED IN WHITE ASPARAGUS INDUSTRY DUE TO INADEQUATE AGRICULTURAL LABOR

(Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able, conscientious, and knowledgeable Members of this House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] has recently completed a thorough and comprehensive study concerning the effect of the termination of the bracero program on various crops grown in his district.

His February 3, 1966, report concerns white asparagus, only one of many commodities affected by Public Law 78, Public Law 414, and the many executive decisions and regulations of the Secretary of Labor regarding supplemental labor.

Other crops, and the growers, workers and consumers involved, were also adversely affected. I ask unanimous consent to include the report of Mr. BALDWIN so that Members of Congress will have a true and accurate report of the conditions of agriculture and consequences of the supplemental labor experiments of the Secretary of Labor.

REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, JOHN F. BALDWIN, FEBRUARY 3, 1966

DEAR FRIENDS: There has been much discussion in California as to the specific impact of the termination of the Mexican national or bracero program on the various crops for which such supplemental labor had been formerly used. Since the program terminated on December 31, 1964, there has now been a full crop year since its termination, so it is possible to make some specific comparisons. Perhaps the crop that has been most exclusively a Delta crop, and which formerly used many bracero supplemental laborers, was the asparagus crop. California produces 100 percent of the white asparagus crop grown in the United States, and this is grown exclusively in San Joaquin, Contra Costa, Yolo, and Sacramento Counties. In fact, these 4 counties grow 80 percent of the world production of white asparagus.

White asparagus has been a major export item and has been an important part of our foreign market trade. From 1960 to 1964 canned white asparagus in California averaged approximately 2.4 million cases. During the same period the percentage of the white asparagus pack of the total asparagus pack in California averaged 63.5 percent. During the

period 1959 to 1964 the number of cases of asparagus exported by the United States increased from 1,007,995 to 2,058,150, and their dollar export value increased from \$5,785,090 to \$15,571,300. In 1963 and 1964 U.S. exported canned asparagus represented more than 50 percent of all export vegetable items from the United States. In these same 2 years California white asparagus represented approximately 98 percent of our total U.S. asparagus exports (the remaining 2 percent was green asparagus). California white asparagus exports from 1960 to 1964 averaged approximately 1.9 million cases.

Although the specific Mexican national or bracero law expired on December 31, 1964, the Secretary of Labor still has authority under the general immigration law to issue permits for supplemental foreign labor to come into this country to assist in harvesting any crop where the Secretary makes a determination that the supply of domestic labor ready and willing to do that type of work is not adequate and that prevailing wages in the area will be paid. The Secretary has repeatedly exercised this authority on behalf of the State of Florida and has allowed many people from the West Indies to come into Florida to help harvest crops in that State at substantially lower wages than are paid in California. However, he discriminated against California by refusing to do the same for our State. When he has allowed a few to be admitted, they have been too few and too late.

What happened in California in 1965 because of lack of labor willing to harvest asparagus? The 1965 California white asparagus pack was reduced to 1,269,000 cases, a reduction of 52.7 percent. This was down from 2,659,000 cases in 1964. The foreign trade demand for white asparagus in 1965 was greater than in any previous year. Asparagus acreage which was originally planned for harvest in 1965 was sufficient to more than adequately serve this foreign demand. However, when Public Law 78 terminated under which braceros could be specifically admitted to this country, 16,243 acres of asparagus was plowed up by farmers who felt that it would be impossible to get adequate labor to harvest the crop. In addition, during the year 1965 an estimated 8,423 acres was plowed up by farmers who tried but found it impossible to get adequate competent labor to harvest the fields. Unharvested asparagus losses were estimated at \$6.6 million. It is estimated that if this asparagus could have been harvested, at least 50 or 55 percent of this lost value would have been paid in wages to labor. Half of our foreign market export trade was lost because we could not fill the orders. The productivity of the domestic labor used in the asparagus fields fell off substantially, because much of it was not experienced and some not conscientious. Wage rates in picking asparagus went up substantially, far in excess of the administration's so-called maximum guidelines under which a 3.2 percent increase in wages and prices has been set as a maximum. Hundreds of jobs of cannery workers in Contra Costa and adjoining counties were either terminated or greatly reduced from a time standpoint. Scores of truckers lost their jobs because there was no asparagus to haul. Some asparagus farmers went bankrupt. The price of asparagus in grocery stores skyrocketed.

Here are a few of the results of the administration's unyielding policy against providing adequately for the harvest labor requirements of the California asparagus farmer:

1. California white asparagus lost half of its export market in 1 year because orders couldn't be filled, although it had taken many painstaking years to build up this market.

2. This was a serious, adverse blow to our U.S. balance of payments.

3. At least one-fourth of our total Delta asparagus was plowed up, at staggering losses to growers, as this is normally a 5-year crop.

February 7, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2301

chart presenting a monthly breakdown by country of free world ships arriving in North Vietnam during 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHART B.—Free world ships arriving North Vietnam in 1965

Month	United Kingdom	Japan	Greece	Norway	Netherlands	Lebanon	Malta	Panama	Cyprus	Total
January	10	1	1			2				14
February	15	1	2							18
March	6		2	2	3	1		1		15
April	1		1	3						5
May	7		4	4		1				16
June	5		3	1		1				10
July	4		4	1						9
August	1			2			1		1	5
September	4			2						6
October	4			2					1	7
November	7		1	1						9
December	3		1						1	5
Total	67	2	10	18	3	5	1	1	3	110

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as the monthly unclassified figures are undoubtedly meant to suggest, some progress has been made in reducing this trade but unfortunately that success is not as marked as the unclassified figures would have us believe. I can tell you that the true figure is more than double what we are being told; and that amounts, as I said before, to more arrivals by free world ships than by Communist ships during 1965.

NONSTRATEGIC GOODS ARE VITAL

Just what is the nature of this trade? First of all it is true that the great majority of these free world ships are under charter to Communist countries—Communist China, Soviet Union, Rumania, East Germany, Cuba and others—that is these free world ships are mostly carrying Communist goods to and from North Vietnam. Some have argued that this somehow removes the foul odor about this traffic. I disagree. Any goods or export profits that Ho Chi Minh needs badly enough to hire free world vessels cannot but help Hanoi's overall war effort. I say we should not concede our enemy one extra spool of thread. Considerably more economic pressure can and should be applied to Hanoi.

Similarly, some in our Government have offered us the assurance that no strategic goods have been carried by any of these free world vessels. Again the fragrance of this trade to my way of thinking has not been much sweetened. First of all, although further information may exist with others in our Government, the classified reports I receive from the Department of Defense indicate that we do not have complete knowledge as to the nature of these cargoes.

Second, even if free world ships carry only nonstrategic goods they in effect release Communist vessels for the transportation of more war goods. The ultimate effect is the same. The seaborne source of the supply lines into Hanoi and down to the South is kept open without hindrance. Did we not recently read of members of a crew of a Cuban freighter who jumped ship when they learned they had been ordered to carry weapons from China to North Vietnam when previously their ship had been engaged in so-called nonstrategic traffic?

Mr. Speaker, the stubborn fact remains—North Vietnam is on all-out war economy. Why should free world ships contribute in any way to such an economy whether by carrying goods to or from North Vietnam? I say so long as there is still one free world ship docking at Haiphong we should not relent in our effort to stop this aid and comfort to the enemy.

SOME PROGRESS NOTED

As I indicated earlier some progress has been made toward drying up the enemy's seaborne source of supply. I was gratified to learn that a number of governments have taken steps to remove their flag vessels from this trade.

However, even though some countries have apparently removed their vessels from this trade, it does not necessarily mean that goods from these countries do not find their way to North Vietnam. Let us look again at the unclassified information concerning data for just 1 month. At this point in the Record, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert a chart indicating the origin of cargoes of the five free world ships arriving in North Vietnam during December 1965:

Name	Flag	Cargo origin	North Vietnam port	Date
Aktor	Cyprus	Belgium	Haiphong	Dec. 12
Isabel Erica	British	Hong Kong	Port Campha	Dec. 11
Kanaris	Greek	Communist China	Haiphong	Do.
Newheath	British	Japan	Port Campha	Dec. 12
Wakasa Bay	do.	do.	do.	Do.

All five of these free world ships were under charter to Communist Governments. Four of these ships loaded cargoes in free world ports: one in Belgium, one in Hong Kong, and two in Japan. It

is evident, I submit, that what progress has been made in shutting off free world assistance to Hanoi, while encouraging, is still gravely insufficient.

There is another glaring instance of

the need for greater cooperation from our friends. Of the 119 free world ship arrivals in North Vietnam during 1965, 67 were vessels registered under the flag of the United Kingdom. British officials argue that most of these vessels are under lease to Hong Kong shipping concerns and that they are powerless to interfere with this traffic in the absence of a formal declaration of war. However correct this explanation may be, it clearly does nothing to ameliorate the situation. I for one am not satisfied that ways could not be found. Obviously the British Government has found ways to shut off trade with Rhodesia. For instance, any British national who carries or who supplies certain goods to Rhodesia now faces 6 months in prison or a \$1,400 fine or both. I know of no comparable action taken with those trading with North Vietnam. The British should hardly need reminding that our own Government has given extensive support to the embargo on Rhodesia in a number of ways. We now, for instance, require special export licenses, which, it is reported, the Department of Commerce will not grant in any case, to carry oil and certain other commodities to Rhodesia. It is not my purpose to raise the question of the wisdom of our policy toward Rhodesia, but I would express the hope that in view of what has taken place the British Government would reexamine its policy of "hands off" British-flag vessels trading with North Vietnam.

CUBAN AND NORTH VIETNAMESE TRADE: A DOUBLE STANDARD?

If the attitude of the British Government leaves something to be desired, so does, in my opinion, the attitude of our own Government. It has been the policy and continues to be the policy of the present administration to in effect exempt ships engaged in North Vietnamese trade from the penalties and restrictions imposed upon ships which engage in Cuban trade. Why should we be more considerate of Ho Chi Minh than Castro?

My colleagues will no doubt recall the partially successful efforts made in the last session to prohibit funds under the foreign aid program from going to any country whose merchant ships trade with North Vietnam. What was sought was simply the addition of the words "or to North Vietnam" to the already existing prohibition concerning those who trade with Cuba. By the narrow margin of 174 to 164 the administration succeeded in weakening this prohibition with regard to North Vietnam with a proviso permitting the President, if he determines it in the national interest, to continue foreign aid to countries with flag vessels carrying North Vietnamese trade.

Frankly, I cannot comprehend how it would be in our national interest to permit in any way free world trade with the Hanoi regime. To date I know of no communication from the President to the Congress indicating that such aid will be continued to any nation whose vessels continue to trade with North Vietnam. But neither have we received any indication that any foreign aid funds have been cut off to any such country.

According to the President's report to Congress on the foreign aid assistance

program for fiscal year 1965, which, of course, includes the first 6 months of calendar 1965, the following countries which appear in the above list of ships arriving in North Vietnamese ports during 1965 have received, for instance, military assistance alone in these amounts:

The Netherlands.....	\$1,105,000
Norway.....	35,051,000
Greece.....	63,061,000
Lebanon.....	106,000
Japan.....	18,531,000
Panama.....	220,000

The figures for fiscal year 1966, I am told, are classified. As I already mentioned some of these governments have taken steps to withdraw their ships from such trade but there are still countries who apparently have not.

The concern of Congress over this trade has not been without its effect. A recent State Department statement revealed:

In making diplomatic representations, the executive branch is mindful of the provisions of the recent amendments to foreign assistance legislation which call for the denial of economic and military aid to countries that do not take appropriate steps to remove their ships from the North Vietnam trade. We have notified all affected governments of these legislative provisions, and have continued to press them to obtain maximum cooperation from those very few countries still having ships in trade.

The "no trade or no aid" provision enacted last session clearly indicates the positive role congressional action has played in foreign relations. The State Department's hand was obviously substantially strengthened in dealing with these countries as a result of Congress determination last year.

NORTH VIETNAM TRADERS IN U.S. PORTS

Unfortunately there is another way in which the policy of the executive branch in effect discriminates in favor of trade in North Vietnam. On February 6, 1963, National Security Action Memorandum No. 220 was issued by the National Security Council, which prohibited any vessel which has arrived in Cuba since January 1, 1963, from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes from the United States. According to Report No. 66 issued by the Maritime Administration, 244 free world and Polish-flag ships have made a total of 1,024 trips to Cuba from January 1, 1962, through December 13, 1965. None of these 244 ships are permitted to carry U.S. Government-financed cargoes out of U.S. ports. Close examination revealed that 17 free world vessels which have called at North Vietnamese ports in 1965 appear on this so-called Cuban blacklist and therefore are prohibited from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes, not because of their trade with North Vietnam, but because they have also called at Cuban ports. At this point in the Record, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a chart giving the names of these 17 ships.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHART C.—Free world ships prohibited from carrying U.S. Government financed cargoes because of trade with Cuba which called at North Vietnamese ports in 1965

Name of ship	Flag	Gross tonnage	Date arrived
Amalia.....	Maltese.....	7,304	Aug. 28
Antarctica.....	British.....	8,785	May 21
Avisraith.....	do.....	7,868	June 7
Ho Fung.....	do.....	7,121	Nov. 10
Jolly.....	do.....	8,660	Nov. 12
Nancy Dee.....	do.....	6,547	May 31
Newglade.....	do.....	7,368	Feb. 11
Newmont.....	do.....	7,151	June 20
Phoenician Dawn.....	do.....	8,708	June 13
Santa Gracia.....	do.....	7,229	Jan. 21
Shienfoo.....	do.....	7,127	July 1
Stanwear.....	do.....	8,108	Feb. 23
Aiolos II.....	Lebanese.....	7,256	Jan. 26
Panagos.....	do.....	7,133	Jan. 28
San Spyridon.....	do.....	7,260	Mar. 13
Agios Therapon.....	Greek.....	5,617	July 11
Acie.....	Cyprus.....	7,159	Oct. 16

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, these 17 ships could carry U.S. Government-financed cargoes except for the fact that they had been in Cuba. There is in fact an example of a vessel which was in North Vietnam on January 25, 1965, which, under charter to the Government of India, loaded at Port Arthur, Tex., on July 21, 1965, a food-for-peace cargo of 10,210 long tons of wheat bound for India as authorized under title I, Public Law 480. This vessel, the Greek flag ship, *Saronis*, could not have been hired to carry such a cargo had it ever been in Cuba in the last 3 years. No one, of course, wants to impede the flow of food to a hungry people. This is not necessary, but what is necessary, as I view it, is that the policy of our Government should not be one of awarding public business to vessels which have carried goods for our enemy.

I feel very strongly that we should, moreover, prohibit ships which trade with North Vietnam from not only carrying Government-financed cargoes but from doing any business at all in U.S. ports. I have joined in sponsoring legislation to that effect and I urge my colleagues to consider doing the same. The reason for this is made plain by the fact that this same Greek vessel, *Saronis*, was again in a U.S. port, Newport News, Va., on December 21, 1965, when it sailed with a cargo of coal bound for Brazil. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my bill, H.R. 9946, be

placed in the Record immediately following my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

H.R. 9946

A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 883), is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 27," and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) No article shall be transported in commerce aboard vessels of any foreign shipping interest which allows vessels owned or controlled by such interests to be used, on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, in trade with Communist-dominated North Vietnam.

"(c) As used in subsection (b) of this section, the term 'commerce' means commerce between a point in any State or possession of the United States (including the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) and any point outside thereof or between points in the same State or possession of the United States (including the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) through any point outside thereof.

"(d) As used in subsection (b) of this section, the term 'shipping interest' means any individual, company, or group of companies which has any ownership interest in any ship engaged in such trade.

"(e) As used in subsection (b) of this section, the term 'controlled' means control of movements of a vessel by virtue of ownership interests; agency agreements; charter hire; or otherwise.

"(f) Whoever willfully violates subsection (b) of this section shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(g) The President shall issue such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of subsection (b) of this section."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert a list of free world ships which have called at U.S. ports after having been in North Vietnam during 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHART D.—Free world ships in North Vietnamese and United States ports

Name	Flag	Gross tonnage	In North Vietnam	In United States
Hellas.....	Greek.....	7,176	June 1, 1964 July 11, 1964 Oct. 9, 1964 Oct. 29, 1964	Mar. 10, 1965, New York, 7,555 long tons of bulk steel scrap for United Arab Republic.
Hollands Diep.....	Dutch.....	9,631	July 11, 1965 Mar. 31, 1965	June 23, 1965, San Francisco-Oakland. Loaded 13,000 long tons of petroleum coke for Japan. Aug. 19, 1965, Stockton, Calif. Loaded 11,000 long tons of safflower seed for Japan.
Saronis.....	Greek.....	7,271	Jan. 25, 1965	July 20, 1965, Port Arthur, Tex. Loaded 10,210 long tons of wheat for India (food for peace, title I, Public Law 480). Dec. 21, 1965, Newport News, Va. Loaded coal for Brazil.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be at least two immediate courses of action open which can clearly set the record straight with regard to our Government's attitude with regard to free world ships in North Vietnam. First, the executive branch possesses the authority to establish a so-called black list with respect to North Vietnam as now exists with respect to Cuban trade. This, as I pointed out, would affect only Government-financed cargoes.

It is worth noting that the requirement was also established that in order for a ship to be removed from the so-called Cuban "black list," it is necessary for its owners to pledge that none of the other vessels it controls will engage in the future in Cuban trade. Secondly, Congress, I believe should broaden this prohibition to include all business in U.S. ports both public and private not only with respect to specific vessels which have been in North Vietnamese ports but with respect to the vessels of any shipping interest which allows any one of its ships to profit from trade with the Hanoi regime.

These two courses of action may not be sufficient to completely put a stop to free world traffic in North Vietnam. Other steps may be necessary such as the mining or blockading of the harbors. Nevertheless these two courses of action would serve to make clear what in the past has been unclear; to give Ho Chi Minh unequivocal notice of our determination not to support or tolerate in any fashion any form of free world assistance which contributes to his policy of aggression and subversion.

In the face of the totally negative response to recent efforts to bring the conflict to the conference table, we can only surmise that the Hanoi regime continues to believe that the United States will eventually grow weary under the conditions of a long, limited struggle; and that a Communist victory in South Vietnam is possible.

It seems to me that by failing to eliminate all forms of aid and comfort from the free world to North Vietnam we have presented to Ho Chi Minh an obviously contradictory position which, I believe, can and has contributed to Hanoi's rapid escalation of the war in the expectation of total victory. Until our Government takes a clearer public stand with regard to such free world assistance, our efforts to convince the Hanoi regime of American determination to resist the spread of communism cannot help but be damaged.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, I yield briefly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on this classification question I just wonder why the North Vietnamese know what ships are going to Haiphong, I wonder why the Chinese know what ships are going to Haiphong, and I wonder why the Soviet Union knows what ships are going to Haiphong and why the American people should not know what ships are going into Haiphong.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I cannot answer the gentleman's question, but I ap-

preciate him raising it again. I mentioned earlier in my remarks that I saw no reason for this classification and that the administration is not telling the citizens of our country the whole truth. I believe it is well that this information should be made available. I appreciate the gentleman underscoring my point.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague from Michigan for his concise and very objective presentation here today on a very serious matter. I have joined with him several years now in an effort to prevent foreign aid to our allies who are shipping goods and using their ships to bring goods to North Vietnam. I cannot understand for the life of me how countries like the United Kingdom, which I understand from the gentleman's presentation here today is one of the biggest users of their ships to bring goods into North Vietnam, can continue doing this in view of the fact that we have been such great friends of the United Kingdom.

We were the first country to come to their aid when they ran into difficulty with Rhodesia. We immediately broke off relationships with Rhodesia. We immediately stopped bringing goods into Rhodesia because of the difficulties that the United Kingdom was having there.

I cannot understand for the life of me why a country like Greece continues to bring goods into North Vietnam. If it was not for the Truman plan and our foreign aid, Greece would have fallen into Communist hands many years ago.

We have been a great ally of the Greeks down through the years. We have helped them tremendously with billions of dollars of foreign aid. Yet they persist in bringing goods into North Vietnam, knowing that these goods will be used against our soldiers over there in the conflict at the present time.

I think that the gentleman's crusade and the arguments that he has presented here on the floor, time and time again, have done much to stop many of these countries from continuing this practice. I am pleased to report to him the evidence, as it has been brought before my committee, indicates that the Greek Government is presenting a bill before its Parliament to pass a resolution to stop the ships from going to North Vietnam.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would like to thank the gentleman for his generous remarks, and I would also like to take this occasion to acknowledge the invaluable assistance that he has been during this past year in helping to amend the foreign aid bill, to put some limitations on this problem, some teeth into it.

This is something that is going to require the combined effort of all of us here on both sides of the aisle, and my colleague from Massachusetts has been an invaluable help. I look forward to his assistance in the future.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman very much.

THE SERIOUS JOHNSON-McNAMARA MISCALCULATION CONCERNING NORTH VIETNAMESE AIR STRIKE TARGETS AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MINISH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last Monday I mentioned to the House two significant failures in the management of the war. These were: First, the failure of our bombing of North Vietnamese targets during the period from February through most of December 1965, to accomplish either the objective of slowing down infiltration of North Vietnamese military units to the south, or the objective of raising the price for its aggressions to an amount it is unwilling to pay for continuing them; and second, the failure of the 5 week and 2 day bombing respite to lure Ho Chi Minh anywhere near a negotiating table.

The responsibility for these failures cannot be placed on U.S. military commanders. They are not running the war. It is being run by civilians in Washington, principally President Johnson and Secretary McNamara and their semi-anonymous advisers, most of whom also are civilians untrained to run a war.

Air action over North Vietnam now has resumed. It is the duty of these people frankly to admit that their past choice of ammunition—TNT bombs—and severe limitation on targets just did not produce appreciable results. These Washington war managers seriously miscalculated. They should not perpetuate their mistake. It is likely only to bring renewed frustration. Instead they should give intelligent thought to the discovery of what additional or alternate targets could be more meaningful to the North Vietnamese and apply some creative imagination to determine what ammunition will best damage them. Last Monday I predicted that "both the targets and the ammunition may turn out to be quite unconventional."

The prediction was based on the fact that North Vietnam is a backward, underdeveloped country with a primitive "rice and fish" economy. Unlike the Germany of World War II it cannot be bombed to submission by blowing to fragments a complex, highly integrated industrial economy. Those who place so much stress on "bombing Hanoi and Haiphong to win the war" largely fail to see this distinction. Similarly, North Vietnam's transportation is so primitive it is little wonder that despite United States bombing of roads and rails the infiltration rate of men and supplies from north to south has increased manifold. Bomb damage easily had been sidestepped by a simple switch in North Vietnamese freightloading practices—from wheels to the backs of men.

My prediction of unconventional targets and unconventional ammunition also was based on the fact that "the cultural level of North Vietnam is undoubtedly one of the lowest imaginable. Eighty percent of the population is il-

literate, ignorant to an incredible degree, and subject to the most extraordinary superstitions."—Statement in 1962 by the leftist French historian Gerard Tongas who lived many years in Hanoi until 1960. Some rather interesting and possibly very effective alternatives to our present kind of air strikes in the north open up if we recognize it as "a land where gods, devils, and animistic spirits of inanimate objects are subliminal neighbors during daylight and lurk almost tangibly among the darker patches of night"—American Security Council Washington Report, August 31, 1965. These alternatives—which obviously fall into the category of psychological warfare—involve no killing, no maiming, no physical destruction. In terms of violence they will deescalate rather than escalate the war. But in terms of results they well may be decisive.

Raising the price to Hanoi for continuing its aggressions to the prohibitive level by psywar tactics requires actions to create enough misery, anxiety, wretchedness and distress in the minds of the North Vietnamese people to induce an intense general annoyance with the war. Even a Communist dictatorship cannot long pursue policies so unpopular they bring into being sweeping national disorganization, disturbance, and discontent. Considering the cultural level of the population and its fearful awe of superstitious omens, the task of depopularizing Ho Chi Minh's policy of aggression should be well within the capability of American ingenuity.

The few examples of many possible actions along these lines which I am about to cite are for illustrative purposes and need not be taken as specific recommendations before they are determined to meet all the requirements of psychological warfare operations. They are based on a study of North Vietnamese customs and superstitions made for me by the Library of Congress.

Example: North Vietnam's Red River Delta is the nation's rice bowl. Flooding is controlled by damming upstream and subsequent release of water to rice paddies. Bombing the dams has been rejected because a flood would drown thousands and many more would perish later by starvation from loss of the rice crop. As a nonexplosive alternative many tons of harmless soluble dye might be dropped upstream. A single B-52 is capable of delivering in excess of 27 tons of dye. Consider adding an ingredient which also is harmless but creates an obnoxiously offensive odor. The dye and the odor will be picked up by the growing rice.

North Vietnamese eat rice every day at every meal. The need to eat this kind of unsightly, unappetizing but harmless and nutritious mess day after day could become a dear price to pay for Hanoi's transgressions. It also will deprive the North of its principal export commodity helping to pay the cost of the war.

During their campaigns in East Java in 1946 and 1947 the Dutch dropped harmless soluble dyes in rice paddies. It

caused panic among the native people who believed it to be a manifestation of divine wrath. Effort should be made to assure that a portion of the country's rice crop remains normal. This will generate black market woes and instant hostility toward any government official who attempts to allocate palatable rice, or to collect it for export.

Example: Along with their superstitious nature the people of Vietnam, North and South, have a long, deep-rooted dislike for the Chinese. These facts of their life should be exploited to the fullest, for instance:

To an oriental there is nothing lower than a running dog. Cheap plastic toy models of Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung joined in the shape of running dogs could be airdropped in large quantity.

In Vietnam the ace of spades is considered as deadly an omen as it is in Sicily. Hundreds of thousands of plastic ace of spades playing cards could be dropped throughout the country. Pictures of the two above-mentioned culprits might also be added to the cards.

Seeing a woman on first leaving one's dwelling in the morning is a certain sign in Vietnam the day will be one of misfortune, therefore rain plastic models of women from the sky during the night to be found as a morning greeting.

On hearing an owl cry "thrice in the night" North Vietnamese flatly expect death in the immediate family. The experience generally results in the strongest sense of dread. Cheap air drop devices which simulate three hoots of an owl should be easy to design.

Except for the owl device all bad-luck air drop items should be constructed to make a distinctive, audible sound as they fall through the air to add the distress of an advance harbinger that bad luck is on its way. The use of plastic for these objectionable symbols rather than paper is desirable because they are just that much harder to get rid of. Air drops of good-luck symbols bearing identification with the Republic of South Vietnam should occasionally be made both for the obvious reason and because they might induce a Pavlovian reaction. It is to be recalled that the Russian psychologist, Pavlov, induced in dogs a state of total disorganization by alternating acts of ill-usage and kindness. Although airdrop items only have been used as illustrations here, radio and all other media, of course, play a role in the conduct of psychological war.

Cutting down the infiltration rate also should be examined in terms of the examples just given. The routes used, loosely described as the Ho Chi Minh Trail, have their beginnings in North Vietnam, traverse several areas of Laos and Cambodia and have multiple entrance points into South Vietnam. Much of the trail is screened by dense tropical forests making ground movement very difficult to detect. A high proportion of the bombs we drop along it blow up trees and bushes instead of Vietcong and their supplies. It is clear that the more superstitious dread we can cause the enemy to associate with this communication line, the more difficult will be his progress along it.

Example: On hillsides visible while marching southward defoliate the shape of the unlucky ace of spades.

Example: Skywrite this and other omens of misfortune and death when Vietcong are estimated to be in locations where they will see them.

Example: Spike the Ho Chi Minh trail with various devices emitting sounds, odors, or other manifestations of doom, death, or displeasure on the part of the spirit world with the goings on. Sowing by air of chemically treated seeds which grow rapidly into bizarre and ominous plant forms should be investigated.

In closing I have a few words for so-called defense intellectuals and assorted sophisticates who will deride and ridicule these suggestions. In war it is as dangerous to overestimate your enemy as it is to underestimate him. If we are going to continue these air operations over North Vietnam which are costly in airmen's lives and aircraft, then we had better take another tack and start getting some effectiveness out of them more equivalent to their cost. This is not a conventional war; it is an unconventional war. Some, but not all, of the strategy and tactics of conventional war can be adapted to unconventional war.

Primarily, an unconventional war requires unconventional strategy and tactics. Psychological warfare is as old as mankind: the assault on the mind is as ancient as the roared battle cry, as historically familiar as the rebel yell, and as modern as the sophisticated techniques of World War II. Its possibilities today are manifold for defeating war of liberation strategy and guerrilla tactics.

Lastly, I have a word for the wisecracks who think they are being cute by shooting supposedly funny wisecracks from the hip whenever their pseudointellectualism is exposed to an idea they are incapable of understanding and comprehending. Let them recall that the Vietnam roll of dead and maimed Americans grows longer every day. Instead of trying to be funny, they should themselves be trying to figure out ways to speed the war's successful conclusion. And, in the unlikely event they happen to come up with an idea, even if it is an unconventional one, they should have the guts to get up and suggest it.

PROBE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous orders of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of the courts to oust Federal Judge Stephen Chandler, of Oklahoma, raises serious questions that should be the subject of an immediate congressional investigation. In the first place, this is clearly an invasion of the rights of the Congress, for it is only the Congress that has the constitutional authority to remove a Federal judge by impeachment.

If Judge Chandler is to be impeached, it should be done by the Congress, and only after a full investigation of all the facts surrounding the action by the circuit court of appeals. I believe that this is particularly important in the light of

nedy to testify under oath, refused to state that he had seen the assault with the knife, although standing within 3 feet of the scene. Mr. Kennedy states that he is convinced that this witness is guilty of outright perjury. The victim of the assault was so mistreated and threatened by friends of Jones that he has now resigned from the Job Corps and has left the State of Idaho.

Jones was recently brought before the Third District Court in Boise for sentencing, at which time Job Corps' officials and his lawyer, Mr. Rowett, also appeared. The district judge, Hon. J. Ray Durtschi, withheld sentence on Jones and placed him on probation for 2 years, with the condition that he serve 4 months in jail, and then return to the Job Corps. A further condition was that he receive psychiatric treatment.

I am sure I reflect the consensus of the group in stating that the concept of the Job Corps and the philosophy which led to its establishment is laudable in every respect. Such provides an opportunity for underprivileged youth to be trained for work and obtain necessary education. We think it is obvious that a group of young people in the 16- to 21-age bracket, most of whom are lacking in education and in the opportunity to compete in our society, are perhaps the most highly impressionable group of persons who could be assembled. Many of them have already had minor brushes with the law. I cannot think of a greater tragedy than having such a group of young people exposed to what is obviously a vicious and mentally disturbed person. To compound the problem, such a person was placed in a position of authority and responsibility over these same highly impressionable corpsmen.

We feel from this incident can be drawn the obvious conclusion that the screening process of the Job Corps is at times, at least, a complete failure. We are informed that the officials at the local Job Corps camp are unable to, or have not determined how many, if any, of their corpsmen are on a present active status of parole or probation from other States. The State board of corrections is reasonably positive that such situations exist and in conformance with the interstate compact, are desirous of being informed of the existence of parolees and probationers from other States who are presently residing within Idaho. We feel this is particularly necessary since we are informed that the Job Corps has no interest in the supervision of parolees or probationers.

We also feel it pertinent to point out that the officials of the State of Idaho concerned with supervising probationers and parolees have had very fine cooperation with the armed services regarding such supervisory problems.

It is also the consensus of the group that the basic concept of the Job Corps, as announced to the public at large, was not to provide rehabilitation institutions for criminals. The public acceptance of the Job Corps locations was, we felt, based on the asserted purpose of the Job Corps as providing training and education for underprivileged young people who deserved an opportunity.

From my own personal standpoint, and while I may not reflect the consensus of the group, I must state that I am highly shocked and indignant at the use of Federal moneys to furnish legal counsel, bail, psychiatric evaluation and treatment, and so forth, to an accused, regardless of whether he be a Federal employee, State employee, or whatever.

As you know, our system of criminal justice in the State of Idaho, for many years has required the appointment of legal counsel for indigent defendants and the reports of our supreme court are replete with opinions stating that the failure to fully and fairly advise an accused of his right to legal counsel, and to furnish such counsel, constitutes the deprivation of constitutional rights. I seriously question the existence of any statutory authorization for such expenditure of Federal funds. Such certainly has never been the case in regard to armed services personnel and I can see no difference between the furnishing of counsel to a Job Corpsman, Federal employee, and the furnishing of legal counsel to a mailman, a U.S. attorney, an elevator operator in a post office building, or a U.S. Senator, any one of whom could be charged with murder or an attempted murder.

We sincerely believe that these matters demand your attention and investigation, if the Job Corps is to continue to have the public confidence and carry out the very laudable program for which it was designed.

I should add that Mr. Kennedy, some time ago, wrote to the Director of the program, Mr. Sargent Shriver, relative to the problems discussed herein, and has not, as yet, received the courtesy of a reply.

DIFFICULTIES WITH THE JOB CORPS PROGRAM

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the obvious result of this case is that enrollees at Mountain Home Job Corps camp believe the law of the jungle prevails and that even officials of the U.S. Government countenance assault with a deadly weapon.

Job Corps officials should be called to account for this episode. Do they believe they are teaching the young men at the Mountain Home camp constructive values by their actions in this case? What justification do they have for hiring an attorney with Federal taxpayers' money, especially when Idaho law requires that indigent defendants be furnished counsel by the State? Why do Job Corps officials want Jones back in the Job Corps under these circumstances? Do they plan to put him back in a position of leadership and authority over his fellow job corpsmen?

FAULTY PHILOSOPHY

This, case, in capsule, demonstrates two damaging and dangerous things about the way the Job Corps program is now being administered.

First, the screening of enrollees is so incredibly haphazard that officials don't

even know when enrollees are on parole for commission of major felonies.

Second, the philosophy of Job Corps officials is so ridiculously soft and confused that they will excuse almost any behavior by an enrollee, even when it jeopardizes the chance of other enrollees to succeed.

The case of Paul Dennis Jones in Idaho is not an isolated one. It is typical of official policy in the Job Corps. This kind of approach in handling tough young men who have committed serious crimes permeates the entire administration of Job Corps camps. It can be fatal to the program unless it is reversed by direct and immediate action.

GANG RULE

Two dropouts from Camp Kilmer recently declared that they would not have enrolled in the Job Corps if they had known what it was like. One of them commented "Many youths sent to court for a minor crime were given a choice between the Job Corps and reform school." A common statement among enrollees is, "If I go back, the Judge will put me in jail." Another enrollee said, "The dormitories are ruled by gangs."

Is it any wonder that Job Corps dormitories are often ruled by gangs when authorities deal so foolishly with felony crimes? Job Corps policy provides specifically:

No dismissals from Job Corps can be made by centers without getting prior approval from Job Corps headquarters * * *. Under no circumstances, explicit or implicit, should a resignation be asked for or the opportunity to resign offered.

REALISM NEEDED

The Job Corps concept is sound, but it cannot be administered successfully by administrators who coddle and encourage lawbreakers and gang leaders. Unless we start getting some realism into the Job Corps program, the American people will rise in indignation and probably sweep out the good potential with the bad performance. That would be tragic for the many youngsters who can be helped by a good Job Corps program, as well as for our society as a whole.

EFFECT ON VIETNAM, COMBAT TROOP MORALE OF U.S. MEDICS

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Under Secretary of Defense commented extensively and favorably to me concerning the morale effect on combat troops, of the type of care rendered by the U.S. medics in South Vietnam. I assured the Under Secretary that this had been true in all services and all wars and engagements since the days of Surg. Gen. Jonathan Letterman who established hospital trains, and a system of evacuation and medical care in its basic modern phases during the War Between the States. I pulled from my desk book references, "The History of the Medical Department, U.S. Army," volume 15, entitled "Personnel in World War II," and referred to chapters on "morale" which under the old War Department setup was considered a vital function of G-1—or

February 7, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2287

tion opposed these proposals, we were able in 1963 to add such a provision to the Vocational Education Act. The projects were never funded by the administration.

The 1964 Poverty Act launched us on a mass production of Job Corps camps without the benefit of experience. The present philosophy of Job Corps administrators is endangering the entire Job Corps approach, which can and should help many youngsters help themselves. The following case history forcefully illustrates our point:

MEMORANDUM ON MOUNTAIN HOME, IDAHO

On November 15, 1965, a vicious fight took place in a dormitory at the Mountain Home Job Corps camp. A corpsman was brutally beaten by Paul Dennis Jones, a fellow corpsman, for playing a radio in the dormitory. With his victim prone, Jones slashed his face and hands with a knife and then plunged the knife into his abdomen.

Up to this point, the story seems like one of those unfortunate incidents that can happen occasionally when you put rough, hard-core young men together in a camp. The full sequence of events, however, is appalling and incredible. They can be summarized in the following 10 points:

1. Jones, the assailant, was what is known in the trade as a three-time loser. He had three felony convictions against him, plus a parole violation, when admitted to the camp.

2. Job Corps officials violated the interstate compact on parole and probations by failing to notify Idaho authorities that Jones was a parolee from California. Not only that, in response to a request from Idaho authorities, officials at the Mountain Home camp are unable to determine, or have refused to determine, how many of their corpsmen are presently on parole or probation from other States.

3. Jones not only was a three-time felony loser, he was serving in a supervisory capacity in the Mountain Home camp as a dormitory leader, wing leader and squad leader.

4. The Job Corps paid for an attorney, bail, and psychiatric treatment for Jones.

5. The Job Corps, by telegram from Washington, asked the court to release Jones on probation, without punishment, on the assurance he would be accepted back at camp.

6. After release from the hospital, the victim was so mistreated and threatened by Jones' friends at the Mountain Home camp that he was forced to resign from the Job Corps.

7. Job Corps officials refused to sign a criminal complaint against Jones and refused to cooperate with the local prosecuting attorney, Mr. Fred Kennedy.

8. The prosecuting attorney had to subpoena other corpsmen in order to get them to testify and at least one of the eye witnesses to the assault, standing 3 feet from the scene, said he saw nothing. The prosecuting attorney is convinced that this witness is guilty of outright perjury, but once again Job Corps officials refused to cooperate or take action to assist the prosecution.

9. The U.S. attorney, Mr. Sylvan Jeppesen, the prosecuting attorney, the warden of the Idaho State Penitentiary, Mr. L. E. Clapp; the vice chairman of the Idaho Board of Correction, Mr. Mark Maxwell; an Idaho parole and probation officer, Mr. Al Roark; an official of the Idaho Employment Security Agency, Mr. Bill Lesh; and the Idaho attorney general, Mr. Allen Shepard were so incensed by the handling of this case by Job Corps officials that they met jointly and determined to bring the matter to the attention of Mr. Shriver and other officials in Washington. The prosecuting attorney wrote Mr. Shriver

in December and, at least until recently, had not even received the courtesy of a routine reply.

10. On the pleading of the Job Corps officials, the district judge withheld sentence on Jones and placed him on probation for 2 years with the condition that he serve 4 months in jail and then return to the Job Corps.

Mr. Speaker, this memorandum is written at the combined suggestions of certain persons who attended a meeting recently in the office of Mr. Sylvan Jeppesen, U.S. attorney. In attendance were Mr. Fred Kennedy, prosecuting attorney for Elmore County, Mr. L. E. Clapp, warden of the Idaho State Penitentiary, Mr. Mark Maxwell, vice chairman of the board of corrections, Mr. Al Roark, parole and probation officer, Mr. Bill Lesh of the employment security agency, Mr. Allen G. Shepard, attorney general of the State of Idaho, and his two assistants.

Mr. Jeppesen stated that he had been requested by Senator CHURCH to attend said meeting, which was called primarily at the instance of Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Clapp.

The discussion involved a recent criminal incident at the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home, Idaho. It was the consensus of those present at the meeting that the entire congressional delegation should be informed both as to the circumstances and the thinking of the group regarding corrective action which should be taken.

On or about November 15, 1965, a vicious fight took place in one of the dormitories of the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home. Said assault allegedly took place as a result of Truley Tillman, a corpsman, playing a radio in a manner disturbing to the other occupants of the dormitory. The dormitory leader, one Paul Dennis Jones, brutally beat Truley Tillman about the head and face. While sitting astride the prone body of Tillman, Jones produced a knife and slashed Tillman about the face and hands, and then plunged the knife into the abdomen of Tillman inflicting a wound of approximately 2½ inches in depth.

The matter was reported almost immediately to Mr. Kennedy as county prosecutor. Because of the question of Federal enclave, the Federal Bureau of Investigation had been called. An FBI investigator was dispatched to the scene that night, interrogated Jones and obtained from him a statement admitting participation in the assault. Mr. Kennedy was approached that night by officials of the Job Corps, who attempted to convince Mr. Kennedy that there should be no criminal proceedings filed against Jones and he should be released to the Corps for administrative action. No person in the Job Corps camp, either corpsmen or official, would sign the criminal complaint against Jones for assault with a deadly weapon, and Mr. Kennedy was, therefore, required to sign the complaint himself.

It was necessary to issue subpoenas and require attendance of Job Corps witnesses in court. The Job Corps officials, through their Washington, D.C.,

office, hired Mr. Robert Rowett, an attorney at Mountain Home, to represent the accused at Federal expense.

At the hearing held therein, Jones entered a plea of guilty to assault with a deadly weapon, and as is usual in such cases, the district judge deferred imposing sentence pending presentence investigation.

At the hearing for sentencing, officials from the Job Corps camp were present. A telegram from the Job Corps headquarters in Washington, D.C., was submitted to the court, which requested that the judge place Jones on probation and affirmatively stated that if said Jones were placed on probation by the court he would be accepted by the Job Corps and returned to the Job Corps camp.

In the course of the presentence investigation, it was determined that Jones is a three-time loser on felony charges, having been convicted and served sentences in California State correctional institutions. The criminal record of Jones can be summarized as follows:

At the age of 16, he attempted to kill two persons by firing nine shots from a revolver. He was admitted to the California Fort Springs Boy's Camp. In 1962, he was convicted of auto theft and received a jail sentence and 3 years' probation. Later in 1962, he was convicted of auto theft and sentenced to an additional 2 years' probation. In 1963, he was adjudged a parole violator, convicted of another auto theft and sentenced to the Soledad Correctional Institution. In 1964, he was paroled and on September 8, 1965, was arrested for driving with a revoked or suspended driver's license, and served a total of 25 days in jail.

At the time of his induction into the Job Corps, he was, and still remains, a parolee of the California correctional system. Idaho, as are all States, is a member of the interstate compact on parole and probations. Under the terms of said compact, each State agrees that it will not permit one of its parolees or probationers to move to another State's jurisdiction without, in advance, informing the receiving State of such desire and making arrangements for the supervision of such parolee or probationer by the receiving State during the balance of parolee or probationer's time. No such notification was received by the State of Idaho, or its board of corrections from either the State of California or the Job Corps. We were informed that said Jones, while at the Job Corps camp, was made a supervisor of other corpsmen in three capacities; dormitory leader, wing leader, and squad leader which would indicate he had rather close supervision of other corpsmen.

Mr. Kennedy has further stated that he has received practically no cooperation from fellow Job Corpsmen witnesses in investigating or processing the defendant for what is obviously a serious crime in the felony category. This, in spite of the fact that the defendant was a three-time convicted felon and but for extremely fortunate circumstances, his latest victim would have died.

One of the eyewitnesses to the assault, another corpsman, called by Mr. Ken-

the Chief of Personnel—but is now forgotten in a computer age. Admittedly, I slipped in a remark about lack of such coordination, referral to, or acceptance of advice of the Chiefs of Technical Services, whether it was in matters of supply taken over by the computers of DSA—Defense Supply Agency—or class 2 control—command and professional assignment of people by the Surgeons General in all services, at all levels—except the theaters of operation.

There was a time when medical care in South Vietnam by so-called USCOM units was primarily among civilians directed by the White House and State Department, and lowered quality medical care to the level of the Far Eastern trained—and French trained—physicians working and operating in barrios and under nonmodern conditions; rather than elevating and training their type care to our standards of know-how, equipment, and technique. Toward this end, as early as January 1964, hearing records will indicate that I recommended to the Secretary of Defense that our military installations be beefed up and used for both direct care for our service casualties as well as training and demonstration units for the civilian for the physicians and their aids of South Vietnam. From the attached article, paraphrasing the Theater Surgeon Col. Spurgeon Neel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army, I am pleased to report that this has been done. I know many military units have been commended for lack of loss of life, including one in support of units northwest of Saigon which was commended for handling 128 battle casualties in one 24-hour battle without a single loss of life. In the field of evacuation we have recently recommended forward placement of the trained and ready tactical aeromedical evacuation squadrons in order to better maintain the highly developed, but oftentimes improvised rapid evacuation.

Physicians have always served with professional know-how and quickly acquired military acumen, where needed around the world in times of stress. Because their know-how on completion of training is geometrically progressive and greater than their forebearers in recent wars, I predict that the death rate from battle casualties—as well as sick and nonbattle injuries—will continue to improve. It is now less than 1 percent in South Vietnam. No wonder there is high morale among those fortunate enough to be evacuated.

This article, dateline Saigon, South Vietnam, is self-explanatory, and I commend it to all, not only as interesting reading concerning the entire medical departments, but as an accurate estimate of the situation which will improve the morale of the retirees concerning their own, as well as the Nation's youth, who are in this hapless situation:

CHIEF SURGEON A HAPPY MAN—SUPPLY OF U.S. MEDICS IN VIET IS TERMED "IN EXCELLENT SHAPE"

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Col. Spurgeon Neel is a happy man. He has the tools to do his job—save the lives of wounded United States and Vietnamese soldiers in Vietnam.

Neel, chief surgeon for the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (MACV), feels that

he has a more than adequate supply of necessities needed for healing—well trained, dedicated doctors and nurses and excellent medical supplies.

He is free, too, of the usual military red tape. His only boss here is Gen. William C. Westmoreland, U.S. Military Commander in Vietnam.

An ebullient, loquacious man, Neel has first call on anything in the U.S. Army Medical Corps.

The supply of doctors to treat wounded Americans is good, he says: "We are in excellent shape both qualitatively and quantitatively."

Military spokesmen estimate there are well over 300 Army doctors and more than 200 Army nurses in South Vietnam. The Air Force and Navy likely have 150 additional doctors and about 100 nurses.

In Vietnam Neel has two mobile Army surgical hospitals, three field hospitals and two evacuation hospitals. The Navy has its 3d Medical Battalion with C Company at Da Nang, the "Charley Med" that has taken care of so many wounded marines.

In addition, the Korean division has an evacuation hospital of 400 beds, 26 doctors, and 33 nurses.

Working with the medical people in Vietnam, but not under MACV control are six military hospitals in Japan, one on Okinawa and one at Clark Air Force Base Hospital in the Philippines.

Neel says he sometimes has an unusual problem: overreaction to his requests by authorities in the United States.

Sometime ago he asked for a flight surgeon, and they sent out a man who had been instrumental in flight-surgeon training at Fort Rucker, Ala.

I was glad to have him, and he was enthusiastic about coming," Neel said, "but actually it would have been better if he had kept on training other flight surgeons at home."

Neel does have other problems, of course, mainly concerned with logistics. Although he has first priority in the Army Medical Corps, there is still the problem of getting supplies to their destinations at the proper time.

The death rate for soldiers arriving at forward hospitals in World War I was 8½ percent. By World War II this had dropped to 4½ percent, and only 2½ percent of the soldiers reaching forward hospitals in Korea died.

In Vietnam the ratio has been 1 percent or a trifle less.

Neel is proud of the low rate, but he realizes it could easily change if the Vietcong start throwing large masses of troops into battle or bring in heavy artillery or air attacks.

"Actually, we haven't been strained too much yet," Neel says. "Our buildup has been gradual enough that we could pretty well project our medical needs and keep up with them. It hasn't been like Korea, where we found ourselves smack in the middle of a war one Sunday."

Besides the first-rate personnel available to him, Neel believes two factors have been important in the reduced death rate: improved anesthetics and techniques and the ability to provide whole blood to surgeons near the fighting.

Amputations have been greatly reduced by improvements in vascular surgery and the fact that more surgeons can now perform such operations involving the blood vessels.

"In Korea at one time we had only one man in one hospital who was an expert at this," he says. "Now vascular surgery is performed at every military hospital. We also have plastic tubing now that we can use as 'spare parts' in replacing damaged arteries and veins."

Swift movement of wounded men from the battlefield improves the chance of survival.

In Korea only 10 percent of the wounded men were taken out by helicopter. Here it's 90 percent.

The titles "field" and "evacuation" hospital mean little in Vietnam. The 85th Evacuation at Qui Nhon on the central coast, for example, handled many of the first cavalrymen wounded in the Ia Drang fighting, and by no means all of them were evacuated. And the 85th currently is treating about 300 serious malaria cases, most of whom will be returned to duty from the hospital.

Two of the six U.S. military hospitals in Japan handle most of the Vietnamese casualties that arrive in that country. They are Johnson Hospital and Camp Drake, both run by the Army and both recently renovated.

About 1,000 evacuees are in the facilities in Japan, but only 15 percent are men wounded in battle. The others are sick or were injured outside combat.

Only the less serious cases among evacuees are taken to Japan. They are men who are expected to be returned to duty. Serious cases or those, for example, requiring plastic surgery, are flown on to the United States.

U.S. medical authorities in Japan say their supplies and personnel are adequate.

The U.S. Army hospital on Okinawa has been expanded from 350 to 500 beds. The hospital has a sufficient staff, its administrators say.

One of the key out-country hospitals handling wounded is Clark Air Base Hospital near Manila. At Clark some casualties remain, but others, usually critical cases that can be moved, are quickly transferred to other military hospitals in the Pacific area, including Honolulu and Formosa. Some are sent directly to the United States.

There are no serious shortages at Clark, but during such major battles as Iau Drang the hospital was jammed, and doctors and nurses sometimes worked for 48 hours without sleep.

The most serious problem confronting Army doctors is wounded who require brain surgery. There are not many brain surgeons in the Army.

Some U.S. doctors are attached to South Vietnamese units, and many American physicians serve as advisers to the Vietnamese. U.S. medical personnel also hold clinics in every village the Army passes through, passing out medical supplies and treating everything from a scratch to surgery. Individual treatments, a spokesman says, average 20,000 to 30,000 a week.

TARIFF CUT OF 50 PERCENT UNJUSTIFIED

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have had strong misgivings about the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and the 50-percent tariff reductions proposed under it. The tariff cuts would be across the board and very few items would be spared from the 50-percent cut.

The act itself in no sense called for such a drastic operation. This was superimposed on it later by the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

The act itself contemplated something very different. The legislation called for very extensive and detailed hearings by both the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Committee for Trade Information. It called for the gathering of detailed information on the many tariff items, which is to say, the many products which would be subject to duty reductions. The act spelled out the type of

pertinent information that was to be developed in the public hearings.

The hearings were indeed held—3 years ago, or from December 1962 through March 1963. Some 800 witnesses testified or sent in statements, including many Members of this House and the other body. The purpose was to gather full information for measuring the probable effect of tariff reductions on different products.

If a general tariff reduction across the board had been contemplated it would have been unthinkable for Congress to require such hearings or for the hearings actually to be held as they were held. It is obvious that the Congress had no intention of calling for a 50-percent cut across the board. Yet that, with minor exceptions, is precisely what was agreed to with the GATT representatives in a meeting held in May 1963, or nearly 3 years ago.

The agreement with GATT placed the Congress in a ludicrous light and made of the public hearings held by the Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee an unaccountable exercise in the waste of time and money. It was worse. It broke faith with accepted procedure and upset the trust placed in legislative enactments.

Mr. Speaker, these highhanded procedures and the flouting of the statute have been enough to condemn the whole American participation in the Geneva negotiations. Congress should call for a correction, and insist that the unquestionable intent of the law as reflected by the provisions I have mentioned be honored rather than brushed aside as so much chaff. If the Congress permits its laws to be thus interpreted at will by administrators there would be no need of legislating.

This is not all.

On the economic side a deep flaw in our trade statistics that has been producing deceptive effects about this country's competitive position in foreign trade, is coming to light. The public has been led to believe that our position is so strong that we have succeeded in ringing up export surpluses of \$5 to \$7 billion per year in recent years. This optimistic impression has been challenged in recent times. I myself challenged it in a statement on this floor last fall; and I am convinced that the United States is not in good shape in foreign markets, as measured by truly competitive exports.

The one item of manufactured goods in which our exports have prospered has been machinery and industrial equipment; and this is accounted for by the large outflow of capital from this country into production facilities in foreign countries, where labor costs are distinctly lower than here. In manufactured items other than machinery our share of world markets has been shrinking.

We have also increased our exports of farm products, but the increase is accounted for wholly, not by our competitive advantage, but by governmental assistance. Shipments under foreign aid, the food for peace program, et cetera, have lifted our farm exports to record

levels, but the American taxpayer has made up the difference between our costs and foreign prices. Therefore the evidence does not support any notion of our competitive superiority.

If the proper corrections are made in our statistics we will find that our vaunted export surplus vanishes so far as it could be taken as evidence of our competitive standing in world markets.

This being the case it is not possible to justify any serious tariff reductions at the present time, much less one of 50 percent.

Since our machinery exports indicate a competitive advantage perhaps that item could withstand a duty reduction; but we should not jeopardize scores of other important products on the ground that our exports of machinery are booming.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution designed to correct the statistical practices complained of so that we may feel confident that the official statistics on which policy is based is sound rather than deceptive.

CONGRESS SHOULD BE GENEROUS IN RECOGNIZING ITS OBLIGATION TO SERVICE PERSONNEL

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, in view of our consideration of legislation to provide education, training, and other readjustment benefits to the men and women of our Armed Forces, I think it is appropriate to call attention to a statement which I have filed with the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in behalf of the bill I have introduced, H.R. 12168, the Veterans' Educational Assistance Act of 1966.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHESTER MIZE
TO VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE IN BE-
HALF OF H.R. 12168, THE VETERANS' EDU-
CATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966, FEBRUARY
7, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the United States has always been generous with its veterans. The Congress and the people have always recognized that compulsory military service demands sacrifices on the part of those called upon to serve their country in times of peace as well as in times of war. Young men and women must leave their jobs, interrupt their educations, and disrupt their family lives in order to fill positions essential to the national security.

In the past we have helped compensate for these sacrifices through federally sponsored programs. After World War II, it was the GI bill of rights; after the Korean conflict it was the Korean bill of rights. These were programs to help the veteran continue his education, retrain for his job, get his family into a home, or start a new business. They have cost billions of dollars, but we have accepted these costs as part of the price we have to pay to keep the Nation secure against the efforts of those who would destroy us or enslave us. It is interesting to note, however, that the billions we spent in these programs have returned additional billions to the economy from the better salaries of the better trained and the better educated veterans.

Since the expiration of the Korean GI bill in January 1955, our country has still had compulsory military training because there has never been a time when we didn't need the services of GI's to carry out defense duties around the globe. We've referred to these periods of service as cold war duties even though they have had the habit of heating up now and then in Berlin, Lebanon, Quemoy and Matsu, Cuba, southeast Asia, and the Dominican Republic.

Legislation has been introduced as a cold war bill of rights and has passed the Senate. This legislation has strong support among Members of the House of Representatives, as witness the number of bills which have come before this committee. It is generally accepted, although somewhat reluctantly by the administration, that the Nation provide readjustment benefits for our service men and women as long as we find it necessary to call them into the service of their country.

We differ as to the degree of this assistance, however. In the introduction of my bill, I have joined with my colleagues who feel that we should include all veterans who have had at least 6 months of military service from February 1, 1955, to the termination of their compulsory service. Those who become eligible on the basis of their service would earn education or training time at the rate of 1½ days for each day of military service. A limit of 36 months would be placed upon the total amount of education and training to which a veteran would be entitled. He would have to start his program within 3 years after discharge and would be required to complete it within 8 years after discharge.

Funds would be provided to each eligible veteran to help him pursue a program of education and training, full time or part time. The allowances could be used toward defraying the costs of subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment. Funds would also be available should the veteran choose a program of on-the-job training or on-the-farm training.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which I and several of my colleagues have introduced, does not differ in principle from the other bills which have been introduced. It recognizes the obligation we have to the men and women we call into the armed services. Our bill is more generous in many respects than the other bills, but certainly this is no time to be niggardly, especially in view of what our service personnel are being asked to face in Vietnam. I would hope that the generous provisions incorporated in H.R. 12168 would be ones which would prevail in the legislation adopted by the 89th Congress. Although generous, the provisions are reasonable, and are partial compensation to the few who have had to make sacrifices in defense of the many who can remain at home, stay on their jobs or continue their educations, enjoy their families and risk neither life nor limb in their pursuit of happiness.

HARVEST LOSSES RESULTING FROM TERMINATION OF BRACERO PRO- GRAM

(Mr. TEAGUE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following summarization of a report by the University of California relating to harvest losses as a result of the termination of the bracero program.

The report may be summarized as follows: What does it all add up to? Just this. While gross revenues may have in-

California, Hon. JAMES B. UTT—an identical bill having been introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from New York, Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH—and the committee is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1966.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Having thoroughly enjoyed my work on this committee, I wish to advise the House that this resignation is being submitted in accordance with a decision of our committee on committees that members of the Committee on Rules should not have dual committee assignments.

Sincerely yours,

DELBERT L. LATTA,
Representative to Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 720

Resolved, That GEORGE V. HANSEN, of Idaho, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Agriculture.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPOSAL TO DROP PLASTIC ACES OF SPADES ON THE ENEMY

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California's [Mr. HOSMER] weekly speeches are making a most valuable contribution to our strategic thinking on Vietnam, in fact, it is not too much to say that they are beginning to do for Monday what is already being done for Sunday by Steve Canyon.

Admirers of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] have been in a state of suspense since last week when he closed with this warning:

Both the targets and the ammunition may turn out to be quite unconventional—I shall say more about them in the near future.

Monday is here again, and we can now read on.

What the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has come up with is certainly original—a welcome new initiative—but we should recognize that his suggestions are no more than a begin-

ning; we should all be grateful to him and the GOP conference committee on nuclear affairs, but one cannot help feeling that their specific suggestions betray an uncharacteristic timidity, one might almost say "conservatism."

His suggestion of showering enemy areas with plastic aces of spades is interesting; even more effective in convincing the enemy that their luck is running out would be the scattering of dice so loaded that they can never roll higher than acey-deucey. Again, the suggestion of dropping plastic women in dawn raids is indeed stimulating; but once again compromised by the gentleman from California's [Mr. HOSMER] disturbing addiction to the synthetic, why should we be content with polystyrene when the Daughters of the American Revolution are clamoring to do their bit?

The only danger that I see in all this is, of course, the ever present possibility of escalation which always has to be balanced against the advantages of any new military initiative. The discovery of new chinks in the enemy's armor—my apologies, Mr. Speaker, for an inadvertent pun—a frivolity inappropriate to the discussion the suggestions of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] deserve—this discovery should always alert one's mind to one's own corresponding vulnerability.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] wants us to take advantage of superstition in North Vietnam; is he so confident that there are no such weaknesses in his own back yard? What if the enemy retaliated in southern California? A few ladders judiciously arranged over the Long Beach Freeway, the Harbor Freeway, and the San Diego Freeway would isolate millions of commuters in his district; a systematic loosening of the tops of salt-cellars would produce lunchtime paralysis; and instead of hundreds of thousands of plastic aces of spades, the distribution of hundreds of thousands of meaningless IBM cards could create economic chaos.

The thought of the gentleman from California's [Mr. HOSMER] district, Mr. Speaker, reminds me of another feature of his speech—a political pointer of great interest, quite apart from the military value of his suggestions: As I listened to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] speech, I was struck by that uncanny feeling "I have been here before", where is it, I thought, that I have seen these plastic women, these plastic running dogs, these hooting devices, these "bizarre and ominous plant forms"? And then I remembered and realized where the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has been getting his inspiration—right next door, Mr. Speaker, in Disneyland. Dare we infer from this that Mr. Disney has now undertaken a role in the councils of the Republican party even more significant than that of advising Senator MURPHY?

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] says, and I have no difficulty in believing him, that his ideas are the outcome of the lucubrations of the GOP conference committee on

nuclear affairs analysis; I think I can best sum up my reaction to these distinguished colleagues of ours in the words used by the Duke of Wellington of the British Regulars before Waterloo:

I don't know what they do to the enemy, but by God they frighten me.

SEVENTY-TWO PERCENT THINK DOMESTIC PROGRAM SHOULD NOT BE REDUCED DESPITE VIETNAM

(Mr. GILLIGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people again have backed the course set by President Johnson. This time, a poll reveals, 72 percent of the public believe the President's domestic program should not be reduced in the face of the Nation's Vietnam commitment.

The Louis Harris poll, published today, February 7, in the Washington Post, indicates that even a majority of conservatives who backed Barry Goldwater in 1964 do not wish to see key programs of the Great Society cut back.

Education and health assistance programs drew the strongest support, the poll indicated. The poll also seems to show the people have answered with a loud "No" the President's questions in his state of the Union message. The questions were:

There are men who cry out that we must sacrifice. Well, let us rather ask them who will they sacrifice? Are they going to sacrifice the children who seek the learning, or the sick who need the medical care, or the families who dwell in squalor now brightened by the hope of home? Will they sacrifice opportunity for the distressed, the beauty of our land, the hope of the poor?

Results of the poll which I call to the attention of my colleagues;

PUBLIC GENERALLY SEES NO REASON YET TO CHOOSE BETWEEN GUNS AND BUTTER

(By Louis Harris)

Although the American people tend to think Congress should slow down from its 1965 pace, 72 percent of the public is equally convinced that President Johnson's domestic program should not be reduced in the face of mounting commitments in Vietnam. The popular conviction seems to be that a nation so rich and prosperous need not yet choose between guns and butter.

Conservatives who backed Barry Goldwater in 1964, Southerners who have consistently resented Federal incursions into their way of life, even high-income groups who suspect recent tax cuts may be shortlived are included among the solid majority opposed to reducing expenditures for key programs of the Great Society.

When pressed to name those Government programs which in case of necessity ought to be cut first, two prime candidates emerged: the space program and aid to cities. The untouchables, in the judgment of most, would be aid to college education and health assistance.

A cross section of the public was asked: "In general, because of Vietnam, do you think President Johnson should reduce the size of his programs at home, such as education, poverty and health, or do you feel these programs should not be reduced?"

	[In percent]		
	Reduce	Don't reduce	Not sure
Nationwide.....	22	72	6
By politics:			
Voted Goldwater in 1964.....	41	50	9
Voted Johnson in 1964.....	12	84	4
By region:			
East.....	16	81	3
Midwest.....	24	69	7
South.....	28	64	8
West.....	24	69	7
By income:			
Under \$4,000.....	18	75	7
\$5,000 to \$9,999.....	21	74	5
\$10,000 and over.....	30	65	5

Time and again, people come back to their central view that domestic programs are important and essential and are high on the list of what our young men are fighting for. But if reductions are to be made, further questioning made clear, people are prepared to draw up their own list of priorities—both for cutting and for keeping.

The cross section was asked:

"Which one of the following programs would you cut first, if one Government program had to be reduced?" and "Which one of the following programs would you cut last, if one of the Government's programs had to be reduced?"

	[In percent]	
	1st cut	Last cut
Space program.....	28	15
Aid to cities.....	24	6
Poverty program.....	20	21
Aid to farmers.....	11	7
Aid to college education.....	6	33
Aid to health care.....	5	15
Not sure.....	6	3

It is possible, of course, that Mr. Johnson's already expressed aim of providing both guns and butter will be realized in 1966. This is the clear hope of a large majority. But if reductions do become necessary, the President's treasured "consensus" may prove to be more difficult to achieve.

MODERNIZATION OF POSTAL FACILITIES

(Mr. POOL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, recently Postmaster Lawrence O'Brien announced a new and expanded effort to modernize our postal facilities through increased mechanization. He proposes to take advantage of all present and future resources offered by science and technology.

Mr. O'Brien is to be commended for his ambition and foresight. The American postal system is the primary means of communication upon which our population relies. With private industry becoming increasingly mechanized, it is only logical and fitting that our national system of communication—the mails—should have the benefit of equivalent mechanized techniques in order to keep up with the times. Keeping abreast of modern methods is a debt owed the consumer public by the Post Office, and I greatly admire Mr. O'Brien for taking the initiative toward a public service of monumental proportion.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I should like to add that I am confident that Mr.

O'Brien, while dedicated to modernizing the postal system through mechanization, is very conscious of the importance of the role of the individual worker in transporting the mails. He has indicated his concern for future adequate manpower, both at management and other levels. For this reason, I can fully support this new and expanded program, for I know the Postmaster General will implement the new mechanization for the greater good of the individual postal worker, as well as for the general public.

This new mechanization means not only better, more efficient mail service, but it also means improved working conditions for thousands of postal employees. Everyone stands to profit from the new postal mechanization.

The only reservation which I have concerning Mr. O'Brien's program is the purchase of 4,000 mailsters. A mailster is the little three-wheeled motorized vehicle used for suburban mail delivery. My office has received some reports of accidents involving these vehicles, and I am concerned for the safety of the postal carriers who make deliveries via these mailsters. If the safety record of these carts is shown to be poor, however, I am certain that the Postmaster General will delete the mailster portion of his program in the interest of the safety of the individual employee. I intend to appeal to him for reconsideration about these mailsters.

I should further like to call to mind at this time an outstanding innovation in the new Post Office program. This is the Office of Planning which Mr. O'Brien will establish. The Office will be staffed by a small, professional core of workers who will concern themselves with planning for the future of the postal service, by coordinating research efforts of Government and private industry. Furthermore, policy and operational decisions in the postal service will be facilitated by the aid of computers.

Americans should be proud of these steps toward progress which Mr. O'Brien has outlined for execution. The U.S. postal system stands to become the most modern postal operation in the world today.

EVERETT L. PALMER—PENNSYLVANIA IS LOSING AN OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on February 1 one of Pennsylvania's outstanding citizens retired as vice president of the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. and is moving to Hanover, N.H. Everett L. Palmer is known and respected by many of us here in the Congress as a trusted friend.

I am sure the people of my State join me in wishing Ev godspeed and great enjoyment in his retirement. Yet, I cannot help but view this event with some regret. We are all acquainted with the great economic and industrial advancement that has occurred in Pennsylvania in recent decades. As a public utility

executive for the past 40 years, Ev Palmer contributed substantially to this growth—growth which is reflected in a higher standard of living for every Pennsylvanian; and, indeed, has contributed to our national prosperity. He will not be easily replaced.

Ev Palmer's interest and contribution has not alone been measured in his work with the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. but also in his interest and concern for education. He has been a trustee of the Western College for Women and of the Moravian College. He was also president of the board of the Moravian Seminary for Girls from 1954 to 1963. In these capacities he has done much to improve these educational institutions.

When Thomas Jefferson spoke to the Republican Citizens of Washington County, Md., on March 31, 1809, he said:

If, in my retirement to the humble station of a private citizen, I am accompanied with the esteem and approbation of my fellow citizens, trophies obtained by the blood-stained steel, or the tattered flags of the tented fields, will never be envied. The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government.

Ev Palmer can be assured that his retirement will be accompanied with the esteem and approbation of his fellow citizens. Furthermore, he may be strengthened in his retirement by the knowledge that he has worked tirelessly toward successful implementation of the "only legitimate object of good government," the care of human life and happiness.

Mr. Speaker, to say merely that Everett L. Palmer's contribution to our growth is appreciated is an understatement. We are all indebted to him. To say simply that Everett L. Palmer is well liked is similarly an understatement. He is loved by many of us not only for his contributions to our material well-being, but, rather, just for being Ev.

Now, he and his lovely wife, Sara, are moving to Hanover, N.H., where, because of his love of skiing, he can spend more time on the slopes. As he leaves Pennsylvania, I can only say to him, "Good luck, Mizpah, and may the ski run be fast."

THE JOB CORPS

(Mr. GOODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and I are friends of the Job Corps concept. As friends of the Job Corps concept, we are deeply distressed and angry about the philosophy prevailing in its administration today. Situations involving Job Corps enrollees from all over the country have come to our attention dramatizing this point. Perhaps the most disgraceful of them all involves the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home, Idaho, which we wish to discuss and express our indignant protest about today.

In doing so, let the record be clear that we sponsored legislation for experimental "residential skill centers" as far back as 1961. Although the administra-

House of Representatives

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture, the words of Jesus, John 14: 1: *Ye believe in God, believe also in Me.*

Almighty God, as we worship Thee and commune with Thee in prayer, may we have our faith deepened that in the warmth of Thy love, our minds may be open to Thy wisdom and a clear vision of Thy truth.

We beseech Thee to endue us with keen insight to see, with courage to obey, and with power to endure and may Thy presence be with us as a light upon the lonely way which we must walk.

Grant that in following Thy steps and obeying the Master's words, we may learn that the truth of Thy divine fatherhood is sure and all transfiguring.

May we be delivered from the cynicism of our time and the clouds of bitterness which it is casting over the earth and help us to believe in the great revelation that Jesus made of life that Thy grace can forgive, cleanse, and redeem all mankind.

In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 3, 1966, was read and approved.

CERTIFICATIONS TO THE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to sundry resolutions of the House agreed to on February 2, 1966, he did on February 3, 1966, make certifications to the U.S. attorney, District of Columbia, as follows:

House Resolution 699: The refusal of Robert M. Shelton to produce certain pertinent papers before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 700: The refusal of Calvin Fred Craig to produce certain pertinent papers before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 701: The refusal of James R. Jones to produce certain pertinent papers before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 702: The refusal of Marshall R. Kornegay to produce certain pertinent papers before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 703: The refusal of Robert E. Scoggin to produce certain pertinent papers before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 704: The refusal of Robert Hudgins to produce certain pertinent papers before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 705: The refusal of George Franklin Dorsett to produce certain pertinent papers before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow the Judiciary Committee be permitted to sit during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. BOLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PROPOSAL TO FRIGHTEN NORTH VIETNAMESE

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I also read in the public press over the weekend the suggestions of the gentleman from California on how to scare the North Vietnamese out of the war.

My father always used to tell me that the best test of somebody's prescription was if he was willing to use it himself. I would be willing to furnish two large plastic axes of spades about the size of a man, and if the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] would care to make himself a walking sandwich, as you sometimes see on the sidewalk, one on the front and one on the back, and walk right into Hanoi, he might be able to scare Ho Chi Minh to death.

THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

(Mr. WELTNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, it may be that Americans, in order to fulfill our obligations in southeast Asia, will someday need to choose between guns and butter. But surely we are not yet come to the point of choosing between guns and milk for the school lunch program. Yet the proposed budget appears to be making that choice for us, and making the choice against milk for schoolchildren.

It is proposed to cut \$82 million from the next year's appropriation. This would mean a reduction of about \$1 mil-

lion for Georgia alone, and would increase the price of milk to schoolchildren to 10 cents a half-pint.

Mr. Speaker, the milk program has been one of the most successful and helpful of Federal school activities. It should, in my opinion, be one of the last, not one of the first, to go.

I have urged reconsideration of this cut, and invite my colleagues to join in an effort to save the school milk program.

VIRGINIA HERITAGE MONTH

(Mr. MARSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of Members of the House that the month from January 19 to February 22 is Virginia Heritage Month.

I would also like to thank the Speaker for using the gavel he is using in presiding over the business of the House today. In connection with Virginia Heritage Month this gavel was presented this morning to the Speaker on behalf of the Governor of Virginia, the Honorable Mills Godwin, by the Harrisonburg High School Distributive Education Club—DECA—a local chapter of the Distributive Education Clubs of America and by the industrial cooperative training group of that same school.

These are the young people who in connection with their high school training are also learning skills of marketing and distribution relating to retailing and wholesale work in the service industries. Some receive training in technical and skilled jobs. They are visiting in Washington and on behalf of the Governor presented to the Speaker this gavel which was made from wood taken from Monticello, the estate of Thomas Jefferson near Charlottesville, Va.

It is a real pleasure to see these young people, who are not only developing their educational skills but also their technical and job skills in order to better prepare them for work in the adult world.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 12563, the Asian Development Bank bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

2195

February 7, 1966

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 9, I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "nay." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the last full paragraph in the middle column on page 1980, during the discussion of Interama, on February 3, 1966, be corrected in the permanent Record, as follows:

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] has made his position crystal clear. I am not taken in by the idea that just because this is going to be administered by a Federal agency that there will not be an excessive amount paid any Federal employee. The position of the gentleman is clear, and I do realize that this resolution which comes to us from the Committee on Rules is not subject to recommitment, and that we either vote it up or down. But I do want to say to the gentleman from Florida that if he were so inclined to yield, it is within the framework of our rules of procedure that such could be done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

UNION OFFICIAL OPPOSES REPEAL OF 14(b)

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, although the fight to retain section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is now being waged in the other body, I continue to receive letters each day from Iowa citizens expressing their opposition to repeal of the section.

These many letters offer further evidence that Iowans in overwhelming numbers favor retention of section 14(b). I was particularly pleased to receive last week a letter from an Iowa labor official in which he expressed his thanks for my vote last year against the repeal legislation. Following are excerpts from his revealing letter:

I was voted into these (union) offices on a secret ballot and my views are well known on my stand on 14(b). A secret ballot among the total membership I am sure would show that they also favor the retention of 14(b).

The full-time paid union officials on the local levels take their instruction from above or this is my opinion of the situation. Privately they quite often take the opposite side of their superiors.

There can be no doubt that an overwhelming majority of the people of Iowa support retention of section 14(b) and the State's right-to-work law. They look to the other body in the hope that their wishes will prevail.

UNITED STATES SHOULD COUNSEL WITH VIETNAM ALLIES

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are all watching hopefully the strategy conferences in Honolulu between President Johnson and Premier Ky of South Vietnam.

It is most unfortunate, however, that the chiefs of state of Australia and South Korea—the only other nations with combat troops in South Vietnam—are not taking part.

Had the President urged that our combat allies be represented, this action would have demonstrated our desire for help at the strategy table as well as on the battlefield. Perhaps it would have encouraged other nations to send combat troops.

Recently Secretary of State Rusk pleaded vainly before the NATO Council in Paris for aid in Vietnam. In doing so, he echoed the distress of the American people. We are all concerned because we are receiving so little help, and worried about what lies ahead if we try to police the world virtually alone.

We can more reasonably expect help in carrying out war plans if we call our allies into council when plans are made. Counseling with Australia and South Korea at this time would be a step in the right direction, and hopefully would lead to broadened free world aid in the defense of South Vietnam.

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on any day this week other than today for the Speaker to recognize a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12563) to provide for participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank, a bill which has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that granting this unanimous-consent request would enable the House to take up under suspension of the rules perhaps tomorrow a bill to create a brand new international bank to go along with the existing multiplicity of international banks and other lending agencies? I am one of those Members of the House who has never seen a copy of the bill. I have had no opportunity to read the hearings or to know anything about the bill. Yet the bill would embark the United States upon the expenditure of perhaps billions of dollars.

Mr. ALBERT. This, of course, would not preclude the gentleman from reading the bill or the report, because I have specifically requested that consideration

of the bill not be made in order until tomorrow or some later day in the week.

Mr. GROSS. Does the distinguished majority leader think that 40 minutes of debate on a bill of this magnitude is adequate?

Mr. ALBERT. In view of the background, I would think, since it was unanimously reported without opposition from either side of the committee it would be adequate. Further, if I may so advise the gentleman since we are trying to expedite the legislative business, we would like very much not to have any legislative business during the latter part of the week, and we would ask the indulgence of the gentleman, because many Members are interested in getting this matter disposed of as early as possible.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I inquire if this unanimous-consent request is granted, would this be programed on Tuesday or Wednesday and not on Thursday or Friday?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct in his assumption.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. May I suggest to the gentleman that the hearings on this bill were conducted by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] who is chairman of the subcommittee. Everyone was heard who desired to be heard. In fact, they even solicited people who were in opposition to any kind of foreign aid to come before the committee to testify and one did come. The hearings were full and complete. Of course, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State and all the people who normally appear came and in addition a gentleman who has quite a reputation in the world as a financier on government budgets and things like that. He is very much in favor of the bill. I think the record is as near perfect as any record can be made. As it affects the situation at this time in southeast Asia, I believe a Member would have a feeling if he sees this bill and reads it, and I understand the gentleman says that he has not read the bill, but it was completed several days ago and will be available with the report tomorrow morning. So there will be the report and the bill available. This is a step in the direction of peace, I will say to the gentleman. It will do more in the direction of peace in southeast Asia so the experts believe than any other bill that we have before the Congress. It does not mean the outlay of very much money, certainly not at this time.

The committee that heard the testimony on this, the subcommittee, on both sides, Republicans as well as Democrats, were unanimously for it, and at the full committee meeting every person there was in favor of it. There was not a dissenting vote. Since it has been unanimously reported by those who know what

ular troops, both Vietcong and North Vietnamese. These regular troops are now contained, kept on the run, and constantly subjected to grave attrition by General Westmoreland's forward strategy. But they would be automatically liberated by a retreat into enclaves and a free gift of all the rest of South Vietnam to the enemy.

The units of North Vietnamese regulars now in South Vietnam equal either four or five divisions. The regiments and battalions of the Vietcong main forces equal eight divisions-plus. In addition, there are 30 Vietcong provincial battalions which could soon be transformed into main force units if they had no further work in their provinces.

Add up these figures. If the forward strategy should be abandoned, the enemy would have available in South Vietnam alone an offensive strength equal to about 16 divisions. In these circumstances, moreover, all of South Vietnam except the enclaves could be rapidly organized for supply purposes. And heavy artillery and five or six additional divisions could be brought down from North Vietnam. It would then be 6 divisions on our side against up to 20 on the enemy's side.

Such would be the enemy's resources for besieging General Gavin's coastal enclaves—and no one familiar with the course of this war can doubt for an instant that the proposed enclaves would be under heavy, obstinate, and bloody siege in a matter of a few weeks or months. General Walt's reported requirements of two full Marine divisions to hold the Danang enclaves was based, it is understood, on a projected siege by five enemy divisions.

The projection was conservative and so was the requirement. It is frightening to contemplate the defense requirement for a Saigon enclave, with its far more difficult geography. In short, General Gavin's proposal unfortunately turns out to be one of two things, both mighty unpleasant.

It is either a proposal to give most of the country to the enemy while putting in far more American troops than General Westmoreland has ever requested. Or it is a plan for a series of coastal Dienbienphus mitigated only by the freedom to turn tail and flee by sea.

UN

BASIC ISSUES IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, no one can deny that the whole Nation is sorely troubled over the present conflict in Vietnam. And these troubles stem as much from our seeming inability to find common ground as from the suffering and bloodshed that are taking place there now. There are some who say that because we are fighting in Vietnam, debate should be closed and we should close ranks behind our forces in the Far East.

Mr. President, I have, since the beginning of this debate, held the position that we have no national choice but to maintain a commitment in South Vietnam, and I also believe that it would be totally foreign to the democratic process and immensely damaging to the concepts of freedom of thought and expression that have buttressed our society from its very inception to close off debate on this issue.

A national debate on a course of action which may well determine the future course of the entire world is not only fitting, it is indispensable. But it serves no interest—our own, or that of the free world—if that debate deals only with superficial questions which seem predicated on eventual withdrawal from Vietnam and ignores the harsh facts of our

responsibility. The gut issue—why we are in Vietnam—becomes dangerously close to being completely obscured if we fail to eliminate in these discussions the irrelevant, the wishful thinking, the procrastinating. Let us stick to the facts. Let's keep the emphasis where it belongs.

Many of the problems around which debate has centered in recent weeks seem to me to be of tactical as opposed to strategic importance, and, while each decision may have some bearing on the conduct of affairs in a particular location or toward the achievement of a particular objective, they have little or no bearing on the single concept from which everything else must follow—why we must stand firm in Vietnam.

This decision has been made, and I think correctly so, in the affirmative; but, of course, the issue is not closed once the decision is made. But it seems to me that it does not serve the purposes of free and open debate when some protagonists attempt not to confront the main decision but rather to erode its edges and blunt its direction by a whole series of discursive arguments which question the efficiency or efficacy of a tactic or a battle plan or of the response or lack of response of diplomatic maneuvers in any one of a hundred areas. With this line of attack, these critics seek to discredit our objective by implying that alleged failures in execution somehow make the ultimate objective less desirable and less worthy of our efforts.

One of these marginal aspects of national debate has concerned itself with the question of how, whether and when to conduct a dialog with the National Liberation Front. I detailed to the Senate last week documentation which supports the charge that the National Liberation Front is nothing more or less than a creature of the North Vietnamese Government in Hanoi and I do not wish to belabor that point today. What I do wish to belabor is the fact that a discussion of credentials of this group is completely beside the point and off the track of where our concern should be centered—our commitment in Vietnam.

Another superficial area of discussion these past few weeks has been the question of the resumption of bombing across the 17th parallel. Again, this should command our concern only on a tactical level. It has no bearing on our ultimate commitment in this area.

Personally, I support the President's decision not only to resume bombing but to limit it in tactical ways as one which represents the best of a bad lot of choices regarding the effort to minimize supply and reinforcement of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese regulars in South Vietnam. But even before the renewal and since, it seems evident that whatever bombing raids have been made on North Vietnam have been so restrained and so selected as to make it conspicuous to anyone willing to look at the facts that we are still seeking to keep every door open for peaceful settlement. But in the final analysis it would not make any difference to our main objective if bombings had continued without a lull or if the lull were to continue indefinitely, for this decision

is made on an analysis of issues which do not affect our primary concern in the Far East.

A similar issue is the hue and cry raised over whether or not we have reacted with hospitality and dispatch to the alleged peace feelers from Hanoi. The harsh truth of the issue is that there has been to date not a single expression directly or indirectly in any form whatsoever from any official sources in North Vietnam and Peiping. Again I believe that those who accuse the administration of duplicity in its reaction to these alleged peace feelers are indulging in deceptions which are most difficult to understand. But here again I also believe that the issue of the reality of these peace feelers is not the issue on which we should stand or retreat in South Vietnam.

Similarly, I cannot believe that concern over the possibility that our actions will trigger the entry of Red China into this conflict can be put forward as a legitimate reason, perhaps excuse would be a better word, for ending our participation in Vietnam. I do not think we can ever limit our willingness to defend the rights of others to those situations where success is guaranteed and where there exists no serious threats to spreading conflict with the potential of engaging us to the limit of our resources. It is not suggested that I welcome or seek a showdown with Red China—that is not the case—but I believe that this possibility is not a valid reason for our withdrawing from the Indochina theater. We are either there because we believe it is fundamental to the national interest, or we should not be there. The threat of hostility from Communist China should not become the top priority yardstick to apply. For once we permit that to take precedence over the other question, then, Mr. President, we lay ourselves open to international blackmail of the most dastardly sort.

Mr. President, a recent newspaper article belabors another secondary concern by noting that in the last year the United States had dropped more than a ton of bombs for each Communist under arms in South Vietnam. The implication was clear that the efforts of our air arm in Vietnam were something less than effective. This may indeed be the case. If it is, this fact should well concern those of our military and diplomatic missions whose job it is to find the best tactic to achieve our ends in Vietnam. But the fact that we have expended so many tons of bombs or discharged any other form of armament has nothing to do with the primary question of the Vietnamese conflict. We should attempt methods which are as effective and as humane as can be achieved in the ugliness of war, but it is a distortion to say that because a tactic succeeds or fails our primary goals are hinged to that success or failure. That is so much nonsense. The question is: What do we have to do to achieve the goals that we regard as legitimate, tested by our experiences in history, measured by our own judgments of what must be restored in Asia, to afford the best opportunity for a con-

structive and more peaceable enterprise in that troubled part of the world?

Another beside-the-point argument we hear is the fact that we have, with the exception of New Zealand, Australia, and South Korea, received little in the way of direct help from our friends around the world. This should not be the criterion for judging the reasonableness of our aim in Vietnam.

We have made this decision on the basis of what is best for our national interests, for the interests of the South Vietnamese, and for the interests of freedom and the chance to develop stability around the world. None of these factors is in any way affected by the willingness of others to take on these burdens and obligation. If they are right and proper, as I believe they are, we would welcome support from anyone who extends it, but should persevere alone if necessary.

A final example of the line of reasoning which I think is irrelevant to the main issue is the contention among some that the Communists relaxed their activities during the holiday cease-fire and that somehow we had not adequately responded to that relaxation. The sad truth of the matter is that the holiday season saw no relaxation in the Vietcong attacks. From December 24, 1965, to January 20, 1966, the eve of the New Year's cease-fire period, 3,728 Vietcong-initiated incidents took place in South Vietnam. Included in these were 79 armed attacks, including 1 of regimental size and 8 of battalion size; 2,411 acts of terrorism and harassment; and 362 acts of sabotage. During the 4-day New Year's cease-fire, a peace initiated by the Vietcong, the same forces conducted 100 incidents against friendly personnel, including 62 against American forces, 29 against the South Vietnamese forces, and 9 against South Korean forces. These facts indicate that wishful thinking is the main ingredient in the contention that a lull occurred over the holiday period. Certainly, we should be alert for any indication from North Vietnam that they are willing to restrict or reduce the scale of this conflict and in such case it would be entirely proper for us to reply in kind, but here again our successes or failures in this context are not and cannot be used as excuses to terminate our efforts entirely. There are many other arguments advanced at various times which seem to me to be used not in an effort to improve our tactical or diplomatic abilities to carry out the day-to-day activities of the conflict, but rather to suggest that our whole effort in Vietnam is unwise and should be terminated.

One cannot escape the feeling that some of those who peddle these questions, who raise these doubts, are really using them to cloak a far deeper intent on their part, and that is to get out, to forfeit, to surrender a responsibility which was thrust upon us not by our own doing, not by our own choosing, but largely by force of the history of our time.

It should be made clear that this is not a suggestion that anything goes in South Vietnam as long as we are trying to obtain our ultimate objectives. It is

a necessity that a continuing review of all our activities at all levels take place in order that we make the best possible use of our potentials and of the commitment in men and materials, both for military and economic purposes, that can be achieved. We also should take care that the tactical decisions are made on the basis of our resolve and our commitment and that we keep our objectives clearly in mind at all times. But these decisions and the type of supervision necessary to police these activities is at an entirely different level than that which points itself to the basic fundamental reason for a commitment with portents as far-reaching as those involved in our decision to stand firm in South Vietnam.

In all fairness, after listening to some of the criticisms which have been peddled about, I must say that we have a far more complex and difficult question in setting up negotiations among Senators, in setting up a conference among critics of the American scene, than in establishing the source of a legitimate or a formidable repository of power on the other side in Vietnam.

Mr. President, it seems to me that there are certain basic considerations which entered into our original decision to resist the expansion of Communist influence over South Vietnam. It is important for any continuing discussion of our Vietnamese commitment to keep not only these basic considerations well in mind, but to also project any analysis of a conflict in Indochina on the full screen of global politics.

It is clear that Vietnam is an inseparable part, but only a part, of what we have been doing over the last 20 years since the end of hostilities in World War II. World War II was almost unique in the history of wars, since the emergence of Western civilizations as a domestic force in the world, since it almost completely upset the traditional balance structures of the world to an extent far surpassing that of any other conflict. In that war three great nations, Germany, Italy, and Japan, were destroyed, and their considerable holdings and their spheres of influence were put on the auction block for the bidding of those who still had resources to devote to filling this power vacuum.

And this war not only stripped the vanquished of their power and possessions, but left two of the victors, England and France, so depleted of manpower and resources that they could no longer sustain their historical roles in maintaining a balance of power around the world.

After this great conflict, demonstrating as it did the arrival of the industrial revolution in the Far East, there no longer existed the certainty that if power were balanced in Europe, that balance would extend around the globe to the colonial possessions of the European powers concerned. If stability and peace were to be restored to the world, a new balance, based upon the realities of post-war life, would have to be struck. In the Far East we saw the withdrawal of the English, the French, and the Dutch from positions of power. And the conflict which now occupies us is the direct result of the death of the colonial system.

As the world faced up to the responsibility of reconstructing itself after World War II, the transition became a process of establishing a balance as the result of unhappy divisions of the existing power centers in the world. Such divisions took place in Berlin and, indeed, across all Germany, and along the 38th parallel in Korea. I think it probable that this same process will ultimately occur along the 17th parallel in Vietnam.

In meeting the challenge of bringing stability to the post-war world, the policy of our country from the outset has been determined by the necessity of preserving this temporary status quo—which is a contradiction in terms illustrating that these accommodations to the power struggle are but a chapter in the ongoing diplomatic history of the world—against erosion by the aggression which has always been waiting to fill any power vacuum.

Thus we committed ourselves in Berlin at the time of the blockade and again in Korea to establish the sanctity of that division of a nation victimized by war, and now in Vietnam, where the issues are similar, if more complex.

The history of man has been the history of a search for lasting peace. And as we study history it becomes apparent that to date man's limitations have led him to develop as the only substitute for international anarchy and war, the concept known as the balance of power. After World War II, two nations emerged possessing the capability to reshape the balance of the world—the United States and the Soviet Union. Russia, even before she adopted her present form of government, has followed a historic concept of national expansion which is based on its assessment of the strength and weaknesses of the world at the moment. More than a century ago, Lord Palmerston in Britain very aptly analyzed this policy of the Russian Bear in terms which apply today. He said that the Russians follow a diplomatic policy of constant probing and pressing outward along their own periphery. When these probes met no resistance, the Russians broke through and extended their holdings, but where they were resisted, they stopped short and moved on to perhaps return to the same spot when the resistance might have relaxed its vigilance.

So what Lord Palmerston said in 1865 is true in 1965, whether it comes from Moscow on the one hand or Peiping on the other.

Thus, even as we sought to exercise the responsibility that England had exercised previously, we tried to establish a balance of power. We sought it when we offered the Soviets Marshall aid without strings, when we offered to share our atomic secrets with her without strings. It did not work. All we received was another "nyet," another "no."

In our attempts to establish a new balance of power, we have pursued two basic policy lines. One is a trust in the utilization of international cooperation where it is effective. The second policy line is the stopping or challenging of the thrust of Communist expansion, even at the risk of war. These risks, never

February 7, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2185

taken lightly, began in Iran in 1946. They were ably described and carried out by President Truman in Greece and Turkey in 1947, and again in Berlin in 1948.

This pursuit of stability was so successful that as Winston Churchill said after the Berlin crisis, if the United States had acted this time as she did in 1918, Russia would be on the Atlantic coast of Europe today. What Churchill said was that because of the willingness of the United States to risk war in behalf of peace, Russia was stopped in Berlin. In fact, one can recast the consequences of American policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union and measure its success in the past 20 years.

Nothing more graphically makes the point than to trace with a piece of chalk on the globe where there is a firm line, from Eastern Europe above Turkey and Greece, Iraq and Iran, Pakistan and India—almost to the China Sea.

Much has been made of the suggestion that the problems we now face in southeast Asia are considerably different than the problems we have faced in Europe because the people of Europe had a culture similar to ours, long history of self-government, and a high level of economic attainment. On the other hand, Asia is best characterized by citing the disruptive forces which have so hindered all attempts to find solutions to the sources of problems endemic to the area. In the first place, we have the confusing power struggles created by the retreat of colonialism. We have the drive for independence and the full flowering of nationalism of all varieties and of all levels of conviction. And now on top of this we have the Sino-Soviet split which has greatly complicated the exercise of diplomacy and economic development in that area.

All of these factors plus a horde of minor problems caused by tribal and cultural misunderstandings and language blocks plus a lack of modern economic development all combine to bring about a factionalization of the power of the area and as a result the further confusion of the power struggle of the world.

As mentioned earlier, the balance in Asia remains inseparable from the balance of the world. How well we can strike that balance will determine our chances of attaining peace. As the situation now stands, southeast Asia remains the most significant area of indecision concerning the balance which must be drawn around the world. This is the area which has for centuries played an historic role in the balance of power even though the battles and decisions took place in other areas of the globe. For the resources of this area, Japan started World War II as she sought to establish her right to help decide world's balance and to substitute a new style of colonialism for the existing situation.

This area has great strategic importance and great economic importance. It lies across the main commercial arteries between East and West. It outflanks India to its west and thrusts forward toward the Philippines and Australia and New Zealand to the east and south.

In this area live 300 million people. In this area are contained many resources—tin, rubber, oil, and rice—and in parts of this area remain some of the last major undeveloped areas in a land which otherwise teems with overpopulation. It constitutes what perhaps represents the largest area of the world still outside the balance structure at this moment.

While we do not need it, it would make a great difference to the needs of China. It represents a major complement to the shortcomings of mankind.

Now we see in the vacuum which has accompanied the end of colonial rule in Indochina an attempt by the Communist forces to extend their domination through this soft spot in the balance between East and West.

We have made the determination that in the interest of peace, in the interest of world stability, and in the hope for progress, we must use our strength to balance the giant capabilities of China in this area.

Many of us had held the hope that out of the ferment of World War II India would emerge as the force capable of balancing the power potential of China. The only other nation with such a capability; namely, Japan, was foreclosed from that role because of her position as a defeated enemy and our distrust of her because of the recent hostilities.

It became evident that India was not going to attain this power position; and since the fact remained that China possessed both monstrous size and power capabilities far out of proportion to that of her neighbors in southeast Asia, the responsibility of acting as counterweight to Chinese power was forced on someone else. Given the nature of power positions in southeast Asia, China's neighbors have limited alternatives of either joining the Chinese under the threat of force or of continuing an independent existence behind a wall of resistance capable of turning back the power of China. Given the history of southeast Asia, it is reasonable to assume that the second alternative is preferable to most of these small Asian nations.

And this brings us back to the point that in the world there is but one nation capable of making the kind of commitment, both military and economic, to contain mainland China, and that nation is the United States of America.

History by now should have taught us the irrevocable lesson that the sooner aggression is stopped, the lower the price for its containment and the more favorable the consequences of resistance.

In the 1930's, the world passed point after point after point where the aggressor could have and should have been held. We should know that as the incidents progressed the price of calling a halt increased and thereby the difficulties of making that decision. These aggressions began in Manchuria in 1931, and incidents took place in the Rhineland in 1935, in Ethiopia in 1936, and again at Munich in 1938.

And we in the United States who had thrown away our option to participate in these far-reaching decisions learned at great price that the cost of appeasing

an aggressor with someone else's territory was a world war. Likewise, the cost of appeasing the Chinese now with somebody else's real estate most likely would mean world war III. It is important that we learn this dear lesson from history as the great British historian Arnold Toynbee said, "History repeats itself only when man makes the same mistakes over again."

We do not have to repeat history to learn from it.

Unhappy and unsatisfying as the attributes of this kind of conflict remain, they will become worse rather than better. This is the first war we have ever fought on television, and this in itself distorts, sensationalizes, and frightens. The reporting of this war is almost entirely on one side. We cannot be honest, studied reportorial service from the other side, and this tests our mettle. This measures our maturity or lack of it in terms of understanding why we must fight. But these should not become excuses for pulling out, nor should they, nor dare they, soften the determination of the Members of this body to see the action through as a matter of our firm policy position.

I can understand the pressures that are brought to bear on Senators. We all are exposed to them. But it is my judgment that the Members of this body, in questions of foreign policy, were sent to this body to lead, not to weigh our mail; to stand tall in the national interest, and not to respond to the intimidations, the emotions, or the understandable fears of those to whom this conflict has taken on a personal basis.

Those apprehensions, deeply rooted as they are in the heart and the soul, are present for all of us, I dare say. But we have been placed in a role of responsibility in a nation that has been compelled to lead the free world, and they constitute obligations really above personal feelings or misgivings. It seems to me that the national interest must take precedence in this instance. I believe that we in this body, are capable of rising to those heights.

In conclusion, let us determine, Mr. President, once and for all, what our priorities really are in Vietnam. As we establish those priorities, let us give them the order of precedence. Let us give them the center of the stage. Let us give them the heart of the argument that they command and require if we are to resolve the divergencies and uncertainties and answer the great question being raised and resolve the great doubts that trouble a nation seeking the path to peace.

PROJECT SIMPATICO

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Research, and as one who has recently traveled extensively in South America, I wish to address myself briefly to Project Simpatico, now in the news from Colombia.

The New York Times of Sunday, February 6, carried a story, datelined Bogotá, Colombia, February 5, headlined, "Simpatico" Issue Stirs Colombians,

February 7, 1966

and I voted against and which in our judgment does not necessarily represent the attitude of Congress today. We feel Congress should share responsibility with the Executive and since it is clear that the President does not intend to ask for a declaration of war this appeared to us as the best method of getting the Congress on record. The amendment is as follows:

"During any period that any armed force of the United States is engaged in armed conflict or hostilities in southeast Asia, no person who is a member of that armed force serving on active duty by virtue of involuntary induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to perform duty in such area, unless (1) such person volunteers for service in such area, or (2) the Congress hereafter authorizes by law the assignment to duty in southeast Asia of persons involuntarily inducted into such Armed Forces."

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

One of the Time staff phoned and asked me to accept an altered version of my telegram which in my judgment was not adequate. Later I was informed that in these circumstances Time would publish no correction.

To keep the record straight I am making this statement on the floor of the Senate. The essential point which Time missed is that the amendment would not forbid sending of draftees to southeast Asia. It would permit their going only after approval by the Congress. My reasons were set forth in my statement on the floor on January 26 and I ask unanimous consent that that statement with its exhibits be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, while I have for nearly 2 years opposed our military intervention in southeast Asia, and feel that no Americans should be sent into combat there, I believe that draftees deserve a special consideration before their commitment to an undeclared war, and that the Congress should have an opportunity to record its position beyond its approval of the White House resolution of August 10, 1964.

There being no objection, the statement and exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFTEES SHOULD NOT BE SENT TO SOUTHEAST ASIA INVOLUNTARILY WITHOUT CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL—AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILLS 2791, 2792, AND 2793

AMENDMENTS NOS. 481, 482, AND 483

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I send to the desk three proposed amendments to bills—S. 2791, S. 2792, and S. 2793—now under consideration by the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations. Those bills authorize additional military and AID programs for Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask that these amendments lie on the table for 3 days, to give others an opportunity to cosponsor them, and that they then be printed and be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, I am offering these amendments to all three bills

because there is no way of ascertaining at this time which of these bills will first come before the Senate for action and also because I believe that they should be considered by both committees.

These three amendments are identical and provide simply that persons drafted into the armed services should not be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without congressional approval.

On August 20, 1965, I had intended to offer a similar amendment to the defense appropriation bill then pending in the Senate. That morning the President asked to see me at the White House. The purpose of our meeting was to enable me to explain to the President in detail my opposition to our military involvement in Vietnam, which I had been voicing on the floor of the Senate for a year and a half. I told the President that I disagreed completely with his administration's position, that three Presidents had pledged support to this policy—that there was in fact no national pledge or an unavoidable commitment—that we had in fact asked ourselves into Vietnam. I also elaborated on my other reasons for believing that our involvement was folly—that it was a war we could not win—that continuation there would lead to greater and greater disaster.

While there, after I expressed my views, I told him I intended to introduce an amendment that very afternoon forbidding draftees to be sent to southeast Asia involuntarily without the consent of the Congress. The President earnestly urged me not to introduce the amendment. He said that in any event no draftees would be sent to Vietnam before January. After repeating his request that I take no such action, he said that if we were not out of Vietnam by January, I would be free to do anything I pleased.

In view of the President's request and his statement to me: "If we are not out of there by January you can do anything you please," I agreed to and did withhold my amendment.

Immediately upon returning to my office, I sent the President by special messenger a copy of my proposed amendment and the remarks I had prepared to make in support of my amendment on that afternoon. These I transmitted to the President with an accompanying letter. I ask unanimous consent that that proposed amendment, my proposed remarks, and my letter to the President of August 20, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, more than 5 months have now elapsed. We are still bogged down in an undeclared war in Vietnam which threatens to escalate into a third world war and the price of which in any event in lives and other costs would be staggering.

While I disapprove entirely of our involvement in Vietnam, it becomes clear that those who have enlisted in any of the Armed Forces have an obligation to go where their Commander in Chief sends them. "Theirs is not to reason why."

But an entirely different situation prevails when we reach into millions of American families and conscript these youths to fight involuntarily in this hopeless mess.

Since there apparently is no intention to ask for a declaration of war, this amendment will serve as a vehicle for Members of Congress to express themselves on an issue which strikes home in a literal sense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, the President has sought no declaration of war from

that branch of the Government which alone is authorized under the Constitution to declare war—the Congress.

Of course, I can understand the difficulty the President would face in seeking a declaration of war. Against whom would he ask Congress to declare war?

Declare war against the Vietcong—or the National Liberation Front—which is one of the two parties involved in the civil war in Vietnam?

Declare war against North Vietnam only, which is now supplying the Vietcong, but where would that leave the Vietcong?

Declare war against Red China—which to date has not committed a man for combat, and is giving little material aid to Vietcong—although shouting much encouragement?

Declare war against Russia—which also is sending materiel to fan the flames of the discord in Vietnam?

It is important, therefore, before further draftees are sent to southeast Asia to fight a ground war in the steaming jungles of Vietnam that each Member of the Senate have an opportunity to express whether—absent such a declaration of war—draftees should involuntarily be sent to southeast Asia.

My amendments will afford an opportunity for each Senator to stand up and be counted.

When I call up my amendment—and I shall do so at the appropriate time—each Senator will have to ask himself these questions:

Is it fair, without an express authorization to that effect by the Congress, for draftees to be sent involuntarily to Vietnam to fight and perhaps die there while well-trained men of the Regular Armed Forces are not fully utilized in the fighting in Vietnam?

Is it fair, without an express authorization to that effect by the Congress, for draftees to be sent involuntarily to Vietnam to fight and perhaps die there while well-trained men in the Armed Forces Reserves—on whose training we have been spending annually well over one and three-quarter billion dollars—are not fully utilized in Vietnam?

Is it fair, without an express authorization to that effect by the Congress, for draftees to be sent involuntarily to Vietnam to fight and perhaps die there while over 300,000 well-trained, experienced troops are stationed in Europe?

I appreciate the fact that, when I call up my amendment, there is a risk that a motion will be made to table it or to amend it in such a way as to nullify its clear purpose. I hope if such a motion is made, it will not be made until there has been open and prolonged debate on the floor of the Senate on every single aspect of the crisis in Vietnam, including how we became involved there and whether we have exhausted every single legal avenue in our search for peace.

But if there is a motion to table my amendment, or to nullify it by amendment, let no one here remain unaware of how a vote to table will be interpreted by millions of mothers, fathers, wives, and children throughout the United States. A vote to table will be interpreted as a vote to send draftees to fight in Vietnam while hundreds of thousands of our regular Armed Forces are undergoing the "rigors" of being stationed in the United States or in Europe—while hundreds of thousands of Reserves are going about their daily civilian jobs, sacrificing only one evening a week or 1 day a month for which they receive pay.

It is high time this issue was debated. It is high time every Member of the Senate stood up and was counted on our involvement in the undeclared war in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared for me by the Department of Defense showing the costs of Reserve and Guard Forces for the past 3 years be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Do you mean Pope Paul? Do you mean Senators who believe communism in Asia will not fall before weapons? Do you mean the millions of Americans who voted for you in 1964 when you counseled them against expanding and elevating the war into North Vietnam?

The President said:

We cannot accept their logic that tyranny 10,000 miles away is not tyranny to concern us, or that subjugation by an armed minority in Asia is different from subjugation by an armed minority in Europe.

I say to the President that the American people have made no unilateral commitment to confront any and all aggressions wherever they occur and by whom they are undertaken. That is the job of the United Nations, if it has any job at all. We have a treaty with the United Nations, but we have no treaty operating to bring us into open warfare with North Vietnam, or even to intervene in South Vietnam.

When the President and his advisers put their trust in the military forces of the United States, and try to equate all the world's problems today with the false analogies with the 1930's, it is they who are blind to experience and deaf to hope. They are blind to the experience of Europeans who thought they could control the affairs of Africa and Asia by force of arms, and they are deaf to the hope that the world's people can find ways of handling their problems without resort to slaughter.

I invite the President, for example, to tell the American people how many people of South Vietnam have been killed and wounded by American air attacks in 1965 alone. The administration is quick to report the terrorist killings of the Vietcong; but they conceal the death and destruction and suffering inflicted upon the people of South Vietnam by our own war activities.

On August 29, 1964, President Johnson made a speech in Texas that greatly contrasted with his militancy in Hawaii. He said in 1964:

I get a lot of advice and I need a lot, and I seek it all the time. I am very happy that the men on this platform with me tonight are the kind of men that I can counsel with and I can trust. I have had advice to load our planes with bombs and to drop them on certain areas that I think would enlarge the war and escalate the war, and result in our committing a good many American boys to fighting a war that I think ought to be fought by the boys of Asia to help protect their own land.

Then up in New Hampshire, during that campaign, the President made another speech, in which he gave the American people every reason to believe that, if he were elected President, he would not lead us into war in southeast Asia. He made that speech on September 28, 1964. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from that speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON, MANCHESTER, N.H., SEPTEMBER 28, 1964

Some of our people—Mr. Nixon, Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Scranton, and Mr. Goldwater—

have all, at some time or other, suggested the possible wisdom of going north in Vietnam. Well, now, before you start attacking someone and you launch a big offensive, you better give some consideration to how you are going to protect what you have. And when a brigadier general can walk down the street of Saigon as they did the other day, and take over the police station, the radio station, and the government without firing a shot, I don't know how much offensive we are prepared to launch. As far as I am concerned, I want to be very cautious and careful, and use it only as a last resort, when I start dropping bombs around that are likely to involve American boys in a war in Asia with 700 million Chinese.

So just for the moment I have not thought that we were ready for American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys. What I have been trying to do, with the situation that I found, was to get the boys in Vietnam to do their own fighting with our advice and with our equipment. That is the course we are following. So we are not going north and drop bombs at this stage of the game, and we are not going south and run out and leave it for the Communists to take over. We have lost 190 American lives, and to each one of those 190 families this is a major war. We lost that many in Texas on the Fourth of July in wrecks. But I often wake up in the night and think about how many I could lose if I made a misstep. When we retaliated in the Tonkin Gulf, we dropped bombs on their nests where they had their PT boats housed, and we dropped them within 35 miles of the Chinese border. I don't know what you would think if they started dropping them 35 miles from your border, but I think that that is something you have to take into consideration.

So we are not going north and we are not going south; we are going to continue to try to get them to save their own freedom with their own men, with our leadership and our officer direction, and such equipment as we can furnish them. We think that losing 190 lives in the period that we have been out there is bad, but it is not like 190,000 that we might lose the first month if we escalated that war. So we are trying somehow to evolve a way, as we have in some other places, where the North Vietnamese and the Chinese Communists finally, after getting worn down, conclude that they will leave their neighbors alone, and if they do we will come home tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in light of those promises, President Johnson's present course of action constitutes an insult to the people in the United States, for they gave him a mandate in November 1964 to keep up out of war, not to send us into a major, massive war in Asia, which I am satisfied he will take us into if he implements the unfortunate speech he made at the airport in Hawaii.

The American people responded to those words, I say to President Johnson, and they gave you your mandate at the polls. You have no commitment in Asia to justify this war. You do have a mandate from the American people, and it was to confine the war, to limit the war, to seek a peaceful solution to the war in South Vietnam.

I ask the President: When is this administration going to fulfill that mandate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending question, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77, to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and may I suggest parenthetically, that the staff of the Senate advise Senators that this quorum will be live.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 29 Leg.]		
Alken	Douglas	Randolph
Bass	Fannin	Ribicoff
Brewster	Hayden	Simpson
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Talmadge
Dirksen	Kuchel	Young, Ohio

Mr. BREWSTER. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Allott	Gore	Mundt
Anderson	Gruening	Muskie
Bartlett	Harris	Neuberger
Bayh	Hartke	Pastore
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Bible	Hill	Prouty
Hoggs	Hruska	Proxmire
Hyrd, Va.	Jackson	Robertson
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Russell, S.C.
Charlson	Lausche	Russell, Ga.
Caso	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Church	Magnuson	Scott
Clark	McCarthy	Smith
Cooper	McClellan	Sparkman
Cotton	McGee	Stennis
Curtis	McGovern	Symington
Dodd	Mondale	Thurmond
Dominick	Mohroney	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Montoya	Yarborough
Ervin	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Moss	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, only a little more than 3 months have elapsed since the Senate expressed a judgment on the question which has been placed before us again.

The opinion of the Senate on this matter was made abundantly clear by a vote in this body on last October 11. In the light of many events which have transpired since that time, there is no reason to believe that any appreciable change has occurred in that opinion. The wisdom of retaining section 14(b) in our national labor code was obvious to many of us then and it is even more so now.

Yet we are again embroiled in a discussion of this issue, at a time when other grave problems are clamoring for attention. The strange priority attached by the administration to the question of repealing section 14(b) becomes more difficult to understand with each passing day.

Most of all, Mr. President, millions of concerned Americans do not understand why the stubborn and unjustified demand of union officials rates such an immediate and high position on the schedule of the Senate. They see no compelling need for reconsideration of a measure which a majority of the Senate so clearly rejected only a few months ago.

It has been suggested by some that our current involvement with the motion to consider repeal of section 14(b) is reflecting adversely on the Senate in the minds of the people.

There is a quick, simple and effective remedy for this, Mr. President. It is readily available to us.

The issue of repealing section 14(b) can be withdrawn from our attention in a matter of seconds, if the proponents of repeal will accept a realistic appraisal of the facts. Withdrawal of the motion to consider H.R. 77 can be accomplished in 10 words or less—and this alternative, I am sure, is open to the administration at any time.

It should be made as clear as the brilliant sunshine of my State of Arizona that the initiative in this matter rests

with the administration and the proponents of repeal.

Those of us who strongly believe in the merit of section 14(b)—and in the basic freedom which it preserves—are not in control of Senate procedure. We are not the ones who are requiring Members of the Senate to reexamine a decision they made only 3 months ago.

That onus rests upon the proponents of repeal. It is they who have this procedural control.

Let every American citizen know that those who want to abridge a vital aspect of individual liberties by repealing section 14(b) are the ones responsible for involving the time and energies of the Senate with this matter.

All the people of this Nation should also know that continued attempts to obtain repeal of section 14(b) can lead only to more futility and delay until such time as the proponents try again to invoke cloture—a move which even most of the proponents concede is doomed in advance.

We are confronted with this pressure for immediate action on a bill to repeal section 14(b)—and yet from the beginning there has been a curious reluctance on the part of proponents to advance any factual arguments to support repeal.

In previous years the public has been subjected to a barrage of propaganda and sloganeering in a multimillion-dollar campaign to discredit 14(b). In many cases the arguments have amounted to outright misstatements of fact and deliberate distortions of the truth.

Even the official statements from the White House have failed to shed any light on why the administration wants section 14(b) repealed.

A year ago, in the state of the Union message, and again last May 18, in the labor message, Congress was told that the President wanted 14(b) repealed in the hope of reducing conflicts in our national labor policy.

This year, the White House has again proposed repeal of 14(b), in its words, "to make the labor laws in all our States equal to the laws of the 31 States which do not have right-to-work measures."

Presumably, the proponents of repeal believe that a policy of enforced conformity would be good for the country. Yet there has been no evidence put forth to indicate this would be so. The American people are asked to accept this proposition without question, apparently on the premise that the administration knows what is best for them.

There can be no doubt that repeal of section 14(b) would directly enlarge the base and scope of the power already concentrated in the hands of union officials in our country. This point has been made very clear in the record of hearings before the labor subcommittees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives last year.

In other words, Mr. President, the Congress and the American people are being asked to swallow the idea that granting additional dictatorial power to a handful of union officials would somehow be in the national interest.

We need look no further back in history than the last few months to see that

such a suggestion is patently absurd.

The facts are that we have recently experienced a series of strikes and disputes which add up to a major crisis in labor-management relations nationally. Viewed in terms of its impact upon the public, this upheaval has assumed serious proportion.

Intermittent strikes have resulted in costly delays for our space program.

Economic losses of more than \$1 billion piled up in the wake of the east coast dock strike only with a little more than 12 months ago. The 80-day cooling off period provided in the Taft-Hartley Act proved powerless to head off the walk-out.

More recently, millions of Americans were disturbed to read about a prolonged strike at a plant of the Olin Mathieson Co., which was the sole current producer of a type of gunpowder required for ammunition being supplied to some of our troops in Vietnam.

In a year that is only a month old, our Nation's largest city has already been paralyzed by a transit union strike for 12 days—a senseless and illegal strike whose ramifications range far beyond the confines of New York City. Here again, estimates of the economic loss approach the billion-dollar mark—and there is no way to measure the resulting inconvenience and human hardship.

These are only a few highlights from the dreary record of labor strife being compiled throughout the land. They do indicate, however, the prevailing climate in which we are being asked to convey still more autocratic power to union officials.

Regrettably, there are some in union leadership who have used their autocratic power not only against the public but also against the best interests and welfare of their own membership ranks.

By a remarkable coincidence, a most interesting communication from President George Meany of the AFL-CIO was appearing in the letters-to-the-editor column of major daily newspapers about the same time. Many Members of the Senate no doubt read this letter when it was printed in the Washington press.

To refresh the Senate's memory, Mr. Meany acknowledged in this letter that public opinion as reflected in an overwhelming majority of the Nation's editorial pages is strongly against repeal of 14(b). Be that as it may, said Mr. Meany, all he is really concerned about is the right to a vote.

Mr. President, if Mr. Meany really means what he wrote, then why does he want the Congress to take away the right to vote on this matter from all the citizens of the 50 States in our land?

This, after all, is the fundamental issue posed by repeal of section 14(b), and I want to commend Mr. Meany for assisting us in focusing national attention on it.

It is precisely this right to vote that I want to see preserved for the people of the United States. They now have this right to take direction action in their respective States on the question of whether unionism should be voluntary or compulsory. Section 14(b) is a specific statement of that right whose con-

Joseph Marion Jones, Mrs. Walter Kendall Myers and Mrs. Torfinn Oftedal, and 30 grandchildren and 6 great-grandchildren. Mrs. Grosvenor, the former Elsie May Bell, died in 1964 at the age of 84.

A private funeral service will be held here tomorrow afternoon, a public service at the National Presbyterian Church in Washington on Wednesday at 2 p.m. The body will be buried in the family vault at the Rock Creek Cemetery there.

MAGIC CARPET TO WORLD

Gilbert Hovey Grosvenor made the National Geographic a magic carpet that carried its readers vicariously to the wondrous and adventurous places of the earth.

No place was too hot, too cold, too high, too deep in the sea nor too dangerous. And it was done in photographs, many stunningly dramatic, such as those in color in the 75th anniversary issue of October 1963, which took the reader effortlessly to the top of the world on the first successful American conquest of Mount Everest.

The same issue also displayed in color the dazzling treasures of the Tutankhamen after they were removed especially from their sealed cases in a Cairo museum.

In one of the few appearances of Dr. Grosvenor's words in print, in the September 23, 1943, issue of the New Yorker magazine, Geoffrey T. Hillman quoted his belief that "the science of geography covered practically everything there is, and that a magazine devoted to its interests should also cover practically everything there is."

Dr. Grosvenor continued:

"A revolutionary idea. Why not popularize the science of geography, and take it into the home of people? Why not transform the society's magazine form from one cold geographic fact, expressed in hieroglyphic terms, which the layman cannot understand, into a vehicle for carrying out the living, breathing, human-interest truth about the great world of ours to the people? Would not that be the greatest agency of all for the diffusion of geographical knowledge?"

"The subject matter covers almost the entire range of nature, from the ant to the elephant, from the hummingbird to the trumpeter swan, from tiny tropical fish to the gigantic whale, from microscopic spores of mold to the mighty sequoia and eucalyptus trees. It deals with nearly every part of the earth, from the teeming pavements of New York and London to equatorial jungle and polar wastes.

"Here, in a photograph, a solitary Moslem kneels beside his camel amid the dreary dunes of the desert, turns his face toward faraway Mecca, and strikes his turbaned brow against the sands in obeisance at the hour of prayer. There, a handsome Rumanian peasant girl, barefoot, in gaily embroidered dress, strides through the cool waters of a mountain stream, her water pitchers swinging from a stick across her shoulder, the joy of living in her eye and step; perhaps she is in love."

FINANCING THE SCIENCES

Walter Sullivan, science editor of the New York Times, has said of Dr. Grosvenor:

"He headed a highly successful organization, in that its magazine, enjoying tax-free status, has long been a great money-maker. Geographers respect the organization as a professional society, and the profits of the magazine have been used to finance a number of important scientific ventures.

"Among these one can cite the Palomar Sky Survey—a monumental atlas of the heavens that stands alone in its field. Likewise, it has supported archeological work that has produced only a modest return in terms of magazine articles—for example, the excavations at Mesa Verde in Colorado and the work of Dr. Louis Seymour Bazett Leakey, the British anthropologist, on some of the most ancient human (and humanlike) re-

mains in Africa (found in the Olduvai Gorge in Tanganyika.)"

Behind the spectacular issues of the magazine, nearly as popular with students as with adults, is the story of Dr. Grosvenor, a preparatory schoolteacher who gave up his post to take a job on the magazine when it had a circulation of 1,000 and no money.

Today the magazine goes into 4.5 million homes, offices, institutions and schools and has reserve capital in the millions.

Dr. Grosvenor's entry into publishing came at the age of 23 in 1899, after his graduation from Amherst College and his marriage to Elsie May Bell, daughter of Alexander Graham Bell, the inventor of the telephone and the president of the National Geographic Society.

The young man (whose name is pronounced "Groyenor") found the magazine at that time as dry as dust to most people because for its technical papers for scientists.

TWO NEW IDEAS

As the new editor, young Grosvenor proposed two innovations—not warmly received, either—to use photographs extensively and sell memberships in the society instead of subscriptions. Members would get the magazine free.

Both ideas, which could not be put into practice for several years, proved astute.

The lavish use of pictures has been described as a pioneering effort at photo journalism. The emphasis was on superior quality and technical excellence in color when it became available.

One of the characteristics of the once dull and dusty magazine became the seminuine photographs, generally of young people in tropical lands.

If much of the writing of the magazine was notably dry, the names of the authors carried weight. Among these were Dr. Grosvenor's father-in-law; his second cousin, William Howard Taft; Robert E. Peary, Adm. Richard E. Byrd, Roald Amundsen, Dr. Frederick A. Cook, whose claim to discovering the North Pole was rejected by the society; William Beebe, Herbert Hoover, Calvin Coolidge, Charles Lindbergh, John D. Rockefeller and Joseph C. Grew.

While the prices paid to authors varied, it was commonly reported that the magazine was one of the highest-paying—about \$5,000 for an acceptable article with acceptable photographs.

The membership plant proved as successful not only because it appealed to the public to be in some small way a sponsor of expeditions, but also because the society was ruled a nonprofit educational organization.

In later years, Dr. Grosvenor, a quiet man with a thin, white mustache, said he could see nothing magic in his formula for the magazine's success.

TURNING POINT IN 1905

To him, the revolution he engineered was simply a matter of obvious commonsense. The turning point in the magazine's fortunes is generally reckoned as having occurred in 1905.

The success has been such that the heavily scientific and eminently respectable American Geographical Society is usually overshadowed in the mind of the public by the National Geographic Society and its magazine. Newspapers, too, sometimes confuse the two organizations.

Dr. Grosvenor was born October 28, 1875, in Constantinople, now Istanbul. His Massachusetts ancestry goes back to 1662. His father was Edwin Augustus Grosvenor, professor of history for two decades at the American-sponsored Robert College in Turkey. Through his mother, Lillian Hovey Waters, he claimed descent from two victims of Salem's witchcraft trials in 1692.

He was one of identical twins. The other, Edwin, died several years ago.

Except for a brief period during the Russo-Turkish War, the twins grew up in Turkey

and came to the United States to go to preparatory school and college.

At Worcester Academy, Gilbert Grosvenor took prizes for writing, Latin, mathematics, and oratory. At Amherst the twins were elected to the scholastic honor fraternity, Phi Beta Kappa, and were graduated magna cum laude in 1897.

Gilbert, who received a master's degree from Amherst in 1901 and a doctor of letters degree in 1926, began teaching languages, algebra, chemistry, and public speaking at the Englewood (N.J.) Academy for Boys, while Edwin studied law. It was at this period that Bell invited Gilbert to Washington, where the little National Geographic Society magazine was being published.

During the next 5 years, Bell paid the youthful Gilbert \$6,900 out of his own pocket, made him managing editor in chief in 1903. Mr. Grosvenor began his innovation with color photography in 1910. In 1920, he became president of the society.

Dr. Grosvenor's collection of academic degrees continued. He received doctor of laws degrees from Georgetown University in 1921, from the College of William and Mary in 1930 and from Lafayette College in 1938. He added doctor of letters degrees from the University of Maryland in 1938 and the University of Miami in 1944. An honorary doctorate of laws was conferred upon him in 1947 by the University of Alaska.

STUDENTS SUPPORT VIETNAM COMMITMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, although the overwhelming majority of young Americans vigorously support the firm commitment of their Government in Vietnam, it often appears that the vocal minority which opposes this commitment is more representative of student opinion.

Every public opinion poll has proven that this is not true. What is true is that the majority of students who support the administration often remain silent. It is always easier to gather opposition to a program than support for it, for those who believe the Nation is on the proper course often fail to see any urgency in making their views known.

Today, however, many young people are reacting to the publicity which has tended to portray their generation as one which fails to understand that the stakes in Vietnam are those of freedom versus tyranny.

Young Americans do understand what is involved in Vietnam. This is evident by the hundreds of thousands of signatures which have come to Washington on petitions endorsing the administration. This is evident in blood drives, and clothing drives, and book drives.

It is also evident in thoughtful resolutions which many student groups have seen fit to pass within their organizations. I wish to share with my colleagues one such statement of support.

This resolution is from the Young Democrats of Colorado at the University of Denver.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER,
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,
Denver, Colo., February 6, 1966.

SENATOR DODD: We, the Young Democrats of Colorado, on the University of Den-

San centers of New York, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco. Too many parents in cities like Evansville have seen their sons and daughters go through college and move on to a vast urban center that seems to offer more challenge, more excitement, than the hometown.

But now we have a shifting again—and perhaps the last great opportunity for Evansville. People are asking in alarm, "What's wrong with New York?" "Can the sickness of the big cities be cured?" People are realizing what overpopulation can do to these cities. They are asking themselves in an age of television and videophone, jet planes and facsimile pictures, whether the price of living in an urban center is a necessary price to pay.

Seldom has opportunity been so sharply outlined—yet largely unrecognized. Evansville and comparable cities may be the wave of the future—if they prepare for it. None of our forefathers and none of us ever could make a more certain investment than creating an atmosphere for living a good life in a clean and satisfying environment—the entity that will be in greatest demand in the next generation.

In 1958, the community organized to meet a crisis. Those who have been involved in the progress of the community since those dark days know that not only must the momentum be maintained, it must be increased if this city is to achieve self-renewal.

Great things are seldom done by unanimity or even consensus—they are done by a few imaginative, creative leaders. A community is the lengthened shadow of its prime movers. Leaders who want to get things done can inspire the people—as New Haven has done in renewing its central city; as Houston is doing in becoming the space center of the United States; as Chicago is doing in overcoming crime and slums. Even small cities can lift themselves—as Stratford, Ontario, did with its annual Shakespeare Festival; as Green Bay does with its support of a major football team.

It's not climate or even location—it is people and the pride of people that make the difference. Look at Minneapolis and St. Paul—just a river apart. St. Paul for generations was the king city of its region. But the leaders in Minneapolis were the ones who had the imagination, the creativity and the desire, and look at how the two cities compare today.

Let us also remember that if we don't move ahead, we're most certain to move back. Even young America is pocked with communities that were once thriving and modern, but now are ghost towns.

WHAT WE CAN ASPIRE TO

And what rewards there are to contemplate. By providing what the future demands, we will create new security, a better way of life, preservation of our freedom, and a glowing sense of accomplishment. What more can we ever hope to gain from our energies and our capital?

We at Mead Johnson pledge our full support, individually and collectively, toward achieving the goal of Evansville's self-renewal. We are eager to join with others similarly dedicated.

I have tried to indicate where I believe our aspirations should lead us. Let us renew our dedication to the challenge and grasp this last great opportunity.

FLOURISHING NATION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in his state of the Union message, the President said:

I can report to you tonight what you have seen for yourselves already in every city and countryside: This Nation is flourishing.

Workers are making more money than ever * * *.

More people are working than ever before in our history—an increase last year of 2½ million jobs.

A recent editorial in the Wyoming Eagle commented on the near full employment which the Nation now enjoys, and stated that "the United States is enjoying the greatest prosperity in all history."

Because this editorial by the Eagle's editor, Bernard Horton, touches upon a subject that is important to all of us, I feel that my colleagues would like to see it and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cheyenne Wyoming Eagle, Jan. 18, 1966]

NEAR FULL EMPLOYMENT

Unemployment dropped in December to 4.1 percent of the labor force—its lowest level in 8½ years.

The U.S. Department of Labor reported that the jobless rate had fallen under the pressures of the military buildup in Vietnam, the economic boom at home, and Great Society programs.

It predicted a further decline below 4 percent by next spring. The December rate was the lowest since May 1957.

The number of Americans with jobs last month was 72,740,000, an all-time record for December. Only 2.6 percent of adult men were out of work—the fewest in more than a decade.

There still were two wildly fluctuating job markets—teenagers and nonwhites. The unemployment rate was well above the national level in those areas.

Teenage unemployment in December was 13.1 percent of the labor force, a slight increase over November. Nonwhites out of work totaled 7.3 percent, a slight decrease.

The otherwise bright labor picture was clouded somewhat by a report from Arthur M. Ross, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, to the effect that some heavy manufacturing centers, as well as certain defense industries, were having trouble finding workers.

The worst manpower squeeze, according to Ross, has been felt in construction and metal-working machinery. He said aircraft ordnance electronics industries, vital to the U.S. defense effort, have had trouble finding skilled engineers, scientists, mathematicians, tool and die makers and other specialists.

The reports underscore several facts:

The United States is enjoying the greatest prosperity in all history.

The Nation is very, very near the long-sought goal of full employment.

There still is need for skilled workers in many fields, and the word "skilled" should be underscored.

Training for these skills is more important than ever.

It is vitally important that teenagers, instead of dropping out of school, continue their education at least through high school. After that they should either continue their education or seek specialized training to qualify themselves for positions requiring particular skills.

DR. GILBERT H. GROSVENOR

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, occasionally, institutions are properly referred to as the lengthened shadow of one man. Never was this more true than of the National Geographic magazine which was developed to its great prestige, usefulness, attractiveness, and wide circulation by Dr. Gilbert H. Grosvenor,

who after a fruitful career as its editor and publisher and for many years president of the National Geographic Society, has died at the ripe age of 90.

Under his guidance the National Geographic has become a national institution. Probably few magazines ever published are so prized and so widely read both for their illustrations and descriptive content.

We Alaskans should be particularly grateful to the staff of the National Geographic for the magnificent photographs of our State's unsurpassed scenic beauty. One of the greatest achievements of the National Geographic magazine, among its many, were the expeditions it sent to the then most remote parts of Alaska after the great volcanic explosion of Katmai in 1912. These expeditions, headed by Dr. Robert Griggs, recording for the first time the sequela of the greatest volcanic upheaval of modern times, led President Woodrow Wilson in 1918 to establish the Katmai National Monument, the largest area in the national park system. It was long famed for its "valley of 10,000 smokes." It continues to be an area of rare beauty and unique natural phenomena as indeed are Alaska's other two great parks and monuments—Mount McKinley National Park and Glacier Bay National Monument.

More recently the National Geographic has published a superb article by W. E. Garrett profusely illustrated, as all of them are, of Alaska's Marine Highway—the State-operated ferry system which travels daily from Prince Rupert, British Columbia, up the famed Inside Passage to its terminus at Haines, stopping on the way at Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Sitka—on every third trip—Juneau, and Skagway.

The National Geographic is a unique magazine and its content has steadily improved through the years. Its every issue is a triumph of the photographic art. It is a living memorial to the vision and enterprise of Gilbert H. Grosvenor.

I ask unanimous consent that the obituary article from the New York Times of Saturday, February 5, entitled "Dr. Gilbert H. Grosvenor Dies—President of Geographic Society" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. GILBERT H. GROSVENOR DIES—PRESIDENT OF GEOGRAPHIC SOCIETY—EDITOR OF MAGAZINE 55 YEARS INTRODUCED PHOTOS, INCREASED CIRCULATION TO 4.5 MILLION

BADDECK, N.S., February 4.—Dr. Gilbert H. Grosvenor, chairman of the board and former president of the National Geographic Society and editor of the National Geographic magazine from 1899 to 1954, died on the Cape Breton Island estate once owned by his father-in-law, the inventor Alexander Graham Bell. He was 90 years old.

Dr. Grosvenor had celebrated his last birthday here on the estate, Beinn Breagh—Gaelic for "beautiful mountain"—on October 28. Illness prevented his return to his home in Bethesda, Md.

With him at his death were his son, Dr. Melville Bell Grosvenor, president of the society and editor of the National Geographic, and a daughter, Dr. Mabel H. Grosvenor. Also surviving are four other daughters, Mrs. Samuel A. Gaylie, Mrs.

ver campus, wish to unanimously affirm our continued support for U.S. policy in Vietnam. In answer to current student protest regarding the present administration's policies, we hereby declare to endorse the following:

1. An ultimate military victory for the United States in Vietnam, or, if possible, a jointly negotiated peace arrived at by all the parties involved.

2. The development by the United States of a feasible means for economic reconstruction and redevelopment in cooperation with the Vietnamese people.

3. Combined action by the United States and Vietnam in the supervision of land and social reforms as needed by the Vietnamese.

In conclusion, we wish to express our unreserved approval for the administration's firm stand regarding the U.S. moral commitments to Vietnam and southeast Asia, and, in the light of present Communist-led aggression, have endorsed the U.S. use of retaliatory military action as seen necessary.

We feel assured that the U.S. policy of moral commitment to Vietnam and southeast Asia will show itself to ourselves and to history as amply justified.

Dr. ROBERT L. ECKELBERG,
ALAN STEINBERG,

President.

MARTIN J. O'DONNELL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recently one of my constituents, Mr. Martin J. O'Donnell, widely known lawyer, died in Kansas City. The contributions he made during his long life are worthy of attention.

Mr. O'Donnell was counsel in many famous cases of this century. Several appear in various student casebooks studied in the law schools of our Nation. Perhaps the most notable was his role in giving concrete meaning to the constitutional guarantee against unreasonable search and seizure. As a 36-year-old lawyer, Mr. O'Donnell argued the case of Weeks against the United States before the Supreme Court. As the lawyers in this body know, the Supreme Court sustained Mr. O'Donnell's contentions in that landmark decision upholding the sanctity and privacy of a man's home.

Mr. O'Donnell was codefense attorney in the murder trial of Robert Stroud, who later became known as the birdman of Alcatraz. The widely known lawyer joined in formulating an appeal to President Woodrow Wilson who commuted Stroud's death sentence.

A soldier in the Spanish-American War, Mr. O'Donnell later became active in the Society of the Army of the Philippines. It was he who offered the resolution which the society adopted to change its name to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. O'Donnell was that organization's first judge advocate general.

Because of his contributions to our national life, it is appropriate that this brief mention of his splendid career be included in the Record of the Senate.

NEGRO HISTORY WEEK, FEBRUARY 12-19

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, during the week of February 12 through 19, particular attention will be drawn throughout the country to the history of the

Negro people. Because we are ashamed of the the slavery and subsequent injustice to which Negroes have been subjected, there is a tendency for us to ignore the history of the Negro people altogether. Too few Americans read about the exploration and exploitation of Africa. Too few of us comprehend the brutality of the slave trade. Too few of us learn of the heroic regiment of Negroes formed in Massachusetts that went to war to end slavery forever and to save the Union. And not enough of us appreciate the gigantic courage of Mary McLeod Bethune, who set up schools for Negro children throughout the South and invested them with her will and her warmth.

More and more, as we work to correct the injustices long suffered by our Negro citizens, we are opening our eyes to the deserved distinction of various persons of unusual ability who happened to be Negro. Fortunately the genius of Carver and Booker T. Washington could not be arrested by prejudice, nor the talents of Mahalia Jackson, Marian Anderson, and Leontyne Price frozen in neglect.

Indeed, American music and art are being enriched by the creative expression of American Negroes. Like the writings of Mark Twain and the politics of Jackson and Lincoln, this non-European influence distills in our culture a uniquely American essence. It is an exciting phenomenon.

For too long, because of our shame, we have ignored vital personalities and events in American history. In doing so we have helped to deprive Negro Americans of the self-respect that is their birthright. During Negro History Week this year let us look with renewed admiration at the endurance of those who have risen despite awesome barriers to profound distinction in many careers, and with pride in the wisdom of those who have propelled our society out of blindness and inertia toward liberty and dignity for every man.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. GILBERT H. GROSVENOR OF THE NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SOCIETY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Dr. Gilbert H. Grosvenor, who succumbed to death last Friday, will long be remembered and honored for his manifold achievements in his long and full life, four score years and ten.

Dr. Grosvenor combined six careers—editor, geographer, educator, scientist, writer, and administrator—to build the National Geographic Society and its monthly magazine into a authoritative organization respected throughout the world.

By his own explorations, discoveries, and writings, Dr. Grosvenor's remembrance will long be perpetuated by the many achievements he made and the many honors he earned. From the time he joined the National Geographic Society until his recent retirement in 1954, his lively interest and support of projects were chiefly responsible for our knowing more about our world and the natural phenomena which inhabit it. The son-

in-law of Alexander Graham Bell, he carried forward the inventive and explorative bent of the Bell family, as well as his own. Both of them, Alexander Graham Bell and Gilbert H. Grosvenor, were cast in the mold of the renaissance man, inventive, scholarly, explorative, inquisitive, and enlightened.

As a tribute to the memory of Mr. Grosvenor, I ask unanimous consent that the article on page one and continuing on page B-4 of the Washington Evening Star of February 4, 1966, "Dr. Grosvenor, 90, dies; Led National Geographic," an article from the Saturday, February 5, 1966, issue of the Washington Daily News entitled "Dr. Gilbert Grosvenor, of Geographic," and an editorial from the Sunday, February 6, 1966, Washington Star, entitled "Gilbert H. Grosvenor," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star,
Feb. 4, 1966]

DR. GROSVENOR, 90, DIES—LED NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC

Dr. Gilbert H. Grosvenor, who built the National Geographic Society and its magazine into the world's largest nonprofit scientific organization, died today at the age of 90.

At the time of his death at Beinn Bhreagh, his summer home at Baddeck, Nova Scotia, Grosvenor was chairman of the society's board of trustees.

Earlier he had distinguished himself as editor, geographer, educator, scientist, writer, and president for the society—combining half a dozen careers in one remarkably active and productive life.

TRANSFORMED LEAN START

When he assumed leadership at the turn of the century the society had only a 1,000 members and an unpromising outlook.

Editing the magazine from 1899 to 1954, he transformed a slim, academic journal into the present highly respected publication that is mailed each month to 4.5 million society members all over the world.

By popularizing and humanizing a once-leaden subject, Grosvenor earned the title, "Geographer to Millions." He stripped geography of its technical wrappings, and brought the wonders of the world to homes and classrooms in the form of vivid words, photographs and maps.

Grosvenor demanded absolute accuracy of his writers, and timely and informative articles of lasting value. As a result, thousands of bound volumes of the National Geographic are continually used as references in libraries, schools, and homes.

PHOTOGRAPH PIONEER

He pioneered in the use of photographs, especially natural-color pictures, as magazine illustrations. At a time when other editors thought photoengravings shoddy and scientists dismissed them as trivial, Grosvenor realized their importance. He used many.

When Grosvenor began work on the magazine, photographs of geographic interest were scarce. He bought a camera, paying more than his month's salary for it, and embarked on more than six decades of picture-taking.

Realizing the need for good maps, Grosvenor organized a first-rate cartographic staff. It produced distinctive maps in color, and contributed original techniques and projections to the science of cartography. From the first, Grosvenor chose timely sub-

jects for maps, thus adding to their interest and usefulness.

Under his leadership, the National Geographic Society sponsored and supported scores of expeditions and research projects. Many were in cooperation with the U.S. Government, scientific institutions and universities.

PROJECTS OF WIDE SCOPE

Those expeditions reached into the stratosphere, down to the ocean's depths, across ice to both poles, and to the remotest corners of the world. The society helped uncover the remains of earliest man, unlock the secrets of pre-Columbian Indians in the Americas, and investigate the lives of present-day primitive peoples. It participated in the creation of a monument sky atlas, and in basic research on cosmic rays, eclipses, and meteors.

In recognition of Grosvenor's advancement of science, many explorers and naturalists named natural features and new species after him. There is a Mount Grosvenor (20,000 feet) in China; a Gilbert Grosvenor Trail and Mountain Range in Antarctica, named by Adm. Richard E. Byrd; Lake Grosvenor on the Alaskan Peninsula; Grosvenor Glacier in the Peruvian Andes; Grosvenor Island in the Canadian Arctic; Grosvenor Arch, a natural bridge in Utah; Cichlornis grosvenori, a thick-ket warbler of New Britain Island. A South American fish, a seashell found in Greenland's waters, and a Chinese drug plant bear scientific variations of Grosvenor's name.

In 1900, Grosvenor was married to Elsie May Bell, daughter of Alexander Graham Bell, inventor of the telephone and the second president of the Society.

WIRELESS TRAVELERS

Dr. and Mrs. Grosvenor traveled indefatigably to gather material for the magazine. Together they journeyed hundreds of thousands of miles by ship, train, airliner, bush plane, and automobile; they rode in caravans and joggled on muleback; they went on foot when the going was really rough.

With camera, they ranged from Alaska to Brazil, from Norwegian fjords to the Cape of Good Hope, from Hong Kong and Hangchow to Cusco and La Paz. They toured North and South America, Europe and the Near East.

Two years after celebrating their golden wedding anniversary, Dr. and Mrs. Grosvenor made a 3-month, 30,000-mile safari through the heart of Africa. He often said Mrs. Grosvenor "gave a magic touch to the society when she consented to marry me."

SKW OVER POLE AT 77

Dr. Grosvenor had to wait until he was 77 to fulfill one ambition. At 11:29 a.m. on May 23, 1953, he flew over the North Pole in an Air Force plane.

Typically, the trip was no mere excursion. Dr. Grosvenor became the first man to locate the pole by making aerial photographs from all sides. A photogrammetric engineer who later checked Dr. Grosvenor's computations found them to be exactly right.

After their African safari, Dr. and Mrs. Grosvenor made two journeys to Alaska, and other trips to the Caribbean, Rome, Istanbul and Bermuda.

Mrs. Grosvenor died on December 26, 1964. Grosvenor brought to his life's work vision and enthusiasm, but no previous experience in journalism. His formative years, however, had given him an unusual interest in geography. He was born October 28, 1875, in Constantinople (Istanbul), Turkey, to American parents, Edwin Augustus and Lillian Hovey Waters Grosvenor. His father was then professor of history at the American-endowed Robert College.

With his twin sons at his heels, the elder Grosvenor explored Istanbul from end to end, gathering material for his two-volume

work, "Constantinople." Gilbert occasionally helped his father with the research.

In 1891, Edwin Grosvenor returned to the United States with his family to teach at Amherst College. Gilbert Grosvenor was graduated from Amherst with the bachelor of arts degree magna cum laude in 1897. He received the master of arts degree in 1901.

Young Grosvenor was teaching at Englewood Academy, New York, when he received an invitation from Dr. Bell, president of the National Geographic Society, and a family friend, to edit the organization's journal.

The magazine was the official organ of the society, founded in 1888 in Washington, D.C., "for the increase and diffusion of geographic knowledge."

The society was badly in debt and the circulation of its magazine was tiny when 23-year-old Gilbert Grosvenor reported for work on April 1, 1899. He was the society's sole paid employee.

SMALL RENTED ROOM

The headquarters was half of a small rented room on the fifth floor of a downtown Washington office building. The room was littered with old magazines, newspapers, and a few ledgers—the only visible property of the society.

For a time, Bell contributed \$100 monthly to the society to pay the editor's salary. But young Grosvenor felt strongly that the organization should not rely on a benefactor's assistance. He resolved to learn, as quickly as possible, what kind of geographic magazine the public would buy.

He studied geographic books that had been widely read and respected for years, searching for the key to their enduring appeal.

"Finally I was convinced that I had the answer," Dr. Grosvenor recalled. "Each was an accurate, eyewitness, firsthand account. Each contained simple, straightforward writing—writing that sought to make pictures in the reader's mind."

Grosvenor's belief in a simple style was strengthened when, with many misgivings, he printed a difficult technical article. Letters of protest came even from educators. From that day on, he decided, the National Geographic would print no sentences that could not be readily understood.

MADE OWN PICTURE

Among the many Geographic articles that Dr. Grosvenor wrote in the early days of his editorship were: "Benguet—the Garden of the Philippines"; "Bulgaria, the Peasant State"; "Colossal Natural Bridges of Utah"; "Fishes That Build Nests and Take Care of Their Young"; "Our Heralds of Storm and Flood (U.S. Weather Bureau)"; and "Progress on the Panama Canal."

Grosvenor wanted exciting pictures, too. Since they were hard to find, he began making pictures for the magazine himself. His first set showed Alexander Graham Bell's dramatic experiments to carry men aloft in his tetrahedral kites.

One December morning in 1904, Grosvenor found himself 11 pages of copy short with no good manuscript available.

FIRST PICTURES OF LHASA

He found a bulky package on his desk and opened it. Inside were 50 striking photographs of the forbidden city of Lhasa, Tibet, taken by a Russian explorer. He offered them to the society free, for publication. The photographs were the first of Tibet's capital and so extraordinary that the editor decided to fill all 11 pages with them.

"When I went home," Grosvenor recalled, "I told my wife I expected to be fired for filling 11 pages with pictures. No magazine had ever done such a thing."

But his anxiety soon was dispelled when members of the society stopped him in the street to tell him how much they enjoyed the photographic layout. A few days later, Grosvenor was unanimously elected to the

society's board of managers, now called trustees.

Color pages soon began appearing regularly in the magazine. The practice, in the words of Historian Frank Luther Mott, "transformed the Geographic into a kind of periodical never before known."

Grosvenor built up a vast collection of natural-color photographs that constitutes a priceless record of the dress, scenery, architecture, and daily life of both the civilized nations and isolated tribal communities of the present age. It will remain a mine of source material for historians.

Meantime, Grosvenor's lively editorial policies were attracting more new members to the society. In 1906, the editor was able to advise the board that an excess of receipts above the expenses would be sufficient to permit the National Geographic Society to begin annual grants for research.

Grosvenor recommended that the society subscribe \$1,000 toward the cost of Robert E. Peary's expedition to the North Pole. This was the first grant by the society from its own resources for the express purpose of exploration.

Through the years Grosvenor attracted a galaxy of explorers and other distinguished men to recount their findings and exploits in lectures and the magazine's pages. These included Peary, Roald Amundsen, Vilhjalmur Stefansson, Adm. Richard E. Byrd, Sir Henry Stanley, Roy Chapman Andrews, Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Gen. John J. Pershing, Joseph C. Grew, Lord Halifax, Elihu Root, J. J. Jusserand, Joseph Conrad, and many others.

The magazine's frequent presentation of timely articles, photographs and maps owed much to Grosvenor's gift for anticipating events.

Visiting Europe in 1913, he came away convinced that war was inevitable. On his return to Washington, he arranged to have a European map, including the new Balkan states, prepared, engraved, printed, and held in waiting. When war broke out in August 1914, National Geographic Society members received an up-to-date map the same month.

WESTERN FRONT MAP IN 1918

The society's famous map of the Western Front, issued in 1918, was in demand all over the world. When Hitler seized Austria in March 1938, the society issued a map of Europe and the Mediterranean. A few days after the Nazis invaded Poland in September 1939, members received a map of Central Europe.

Throughout World War II, National Geographic cartographers worked in close cooperation with the military. Allied armed forces used the society's maps, as well as its countless photographs, taken in peacetime, of suddenly strategic cities, harbors, and railroads.

One morning shortly after Pearl Harbor, a White House aid called Grosvenor and asked for a map showing a little town near Singapore then under Japanese attack. The town did not appear on White House charts. Dr. Grosvenor sent over a map pinpointing the location.

When the society's membership passed the half-million mark in 1917, the board of managers presented Grosvenor with a certificate of appreciation. Three years later, he was elected president of the society. He arranged for reincorporation of the non-profit society so that instead of a board of managers elected annually, society affairs could be directed more efficiently by a board of trustees elected for life.

Grosvenor also managed to find time to pursue his lifelong avocation of nature study. His interest was reflected in many magazine articles on national parks and forests, wild flowers, animals, and the wonders of plant, insect, and marine life.

an unforeseen occurrence could be far more grave than should be.

And the absence of any reliable, long-range Federal fiscal policy or guidelines heightens the susceptibility of the business community, indeed of us all, to impulsive, and convulsive reaction.

This is intolerable in a world where technological advances, speedy, and inexpensive distribution, and massive beneficence are translating human needs and wants into almost limitless effective demand.

Several things can be done to help redress the existing imbalance.

First, the Federal Government could maintain a greater degree of objectivity at the bargaining table and in the marketplace than it has shown recently.

Freedom is the root of our society; and economic freedom is no less in need of nourishment than human rights. The abridgement of either can be fatal to the bloom.

Second, both labor and management must meet their responsibilities for justifying the advocacy of a freer economy.

Inordinate wage and price increases can only lead to self-defeating inflation. Self-restraint is imperative.

The key to greater returns for labor and capital is increased productivity, new product development, and a sharp eye on the marketplace.

And third, long-range Federal tax and spending goals and policies should be spelled out.

This would tend to remove doubt and uncertainty from the minds of producers and consumers, alike.

A 5-year estimated tax program coupled with a 5-year estimated budget would not be an unreasonable task. And it could be a tremendous help in controlling specific Federal expenditures.

Also, Congress and the Nation can and must judge new programs not only in terms of their initial cost, usually modest, but also in terms of their probable additional burden in future years.

While we cannot predict, with certainty, the requirements of our foreign commitments, and particularly, Vietnam, we should be able to make a reasonable estimate of total revenues over a relatively short range of time. The budget argument need not be equated in terms of "guns or butter," but, rather, in the overall capability of our economy to safely support a projected level of total Federal spending.

Once the general limit is set for a specific year, individual programs can be assigned a priority and spending requests adjusted accordingly.

In other words, as I have suggested previously, we should be able to set up general limits for spending and then cut the cloth to fit.

The need for prudence in Federal spending is all the greater because of rising demands at the State and local level.

Which brings us to an examination of the relationship between levels of government, and the appropriate role of each.

All levels of government share a basic responsibility—to act on behalf of the people and in their best interests.

State and local governments, unfortunately, were the sleeping giant of the past few decades. As a consequence, Federal Government began preempting the responsibilities of these units.

And the compulsion to impose national solutions on what, in many instances, are essentially local problems, has continued unabated.

But the giant is awakening.

The total increase in State and local budgets in recent years has outstripped the national budget increase.

Many States, in concert with their local communities, are developing bold and imaginative programs designed to cope with

their specific problems—problems which often differ from State to State.

Education, transportation, conservation and recreation, human services, housing, and increased aid to our cities are all prime targets for urgent action.

In Pennsylvania, for example, more than half of the State budget is spent on education. And this should and will grow.

Consider, also, the relationships of Federal and individual State governments to our modern economy.

They differ sharply.

In the case of my own State, to be sure, we have benefited from the growth in our national economy.

We could not have achieved as much without it.

But we have had periods of national expansion before, and Pennsylvania did not fare nearly so well as she has these past 3 years. In periods of serious, and even modest, recession, we were among the hardest hit.

But the actions and policies of the State government, its communities, and private citizens now bear directly on a State's economic health and its capability for growth. And they should.

By transforming our business climate, by providing effective new tools, by galvanizing our private citizens and local communities into flat-out action, by aggressively promoting diversity in our economic base—by these efforts and more we are now making an impact on Pennsylvania's economy the like of which have not been seen in many decades, if ever.

This same potential for effective State action extends to many other fields. We should not fail to utilize it.

As they face up to their obligations, State and local governments are desperately seeking sources of revenue to fulfill them.

Herein lies a growing basic conflict between Federal and local and State governments.

Rather than expanding the horizons of Federal exploration on the domestic front, more attention must be paid to meeting the financial needs of State and local government, as they perfect the machinery for attacking their own problems.

All the grandiose programs that can be conjured up cannot succeed unless there is at the focal point the knowledge, experience, initiative, skill, and mechanics to make them work.

In too many instances, the Federal Government has bypassed State governments, leaving them in the position of frustrated bystanders. The poverty program is a prime example of this.

Too often, the proliferation and overlapping of Federal and State programs that confront overworked and underpaid local leaders has understandably thrown them into a paroxysm of indecision and confusion.

No society has ever been legislated into existence—and this applies to the Great Society as well. Federal programs are only a means to an end—and if they do not fit the need or are not implemented properly, they are of little use in achieving a desired goal.

If we are to derive the full benefit of our opportunities, we need some breathing space—time for a sorting out of existing tools, and for their full application to the problems at hand.

We need a reappraisal of the respective responsibilities of the different levels of government—particularly a thorough appreciation of the vital role of State government.

To accomplish this, consideration should be given to establishing, at the executive level, a joint White House-Governor's Conference on Federal-State relationships.

This conference would seek to delineate in terms of today's needs and capabilities, the proper respective roles of the State and Fed-

eral Governments in providing solutions for problems which are the concerns of each.

It could catalog and relate the host of Federal and State weapons now available for attacking these problems.

It could give serious consideration to the merit of the plan proposed by Walter Heller, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. The plan provides for the return to the States, with no strings attached, of a fixed portion of Federal tax revenue.

Such a conference could aid immeasurably in clearing the air for more effective concerted government action.

In short, in business, in our communities, in government on all levels, in our policies toward all other nations, we live in a world fraught with danger, bursting with challenge, and blessed with hope.

In the various endeavors of man, responsibility consistently asserts itself as the keystone of order and progress.

If we continue to recognize, accept, and discharge our responsibilities successfully, then we shall overcome the danger, rise to the challenge, and realize the hope.

VN

UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE GEORGE W. BALL DISPELS "THE HANOI MYTH OF AN INDIGENOUS REBELLION"—CLARIFIES PURPOSE OF VIETNAM INVOLVEMENT AND U.S. POLICIES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a truly penetrating discussion of "The Hanoi Myth of an Indigenous Rebellion," is a speech with that title given by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball last week before the Northwestern University Alumni Association at Evanston, Ill.

As published in the Sunday, February 6, 1966, issue of the Washington Post, Under Secretary Ball's timely address opens with this cogent sentence:

The beginning of wisdom with regard to Vietnam is to recognize that what Americans are fighting in the jungles and rice paddies of that unhappy land is not a local conflict—an isolated war that has meaning only for one part of the world.

So, Mr. Ball first stated the effort in Vietnam in terms of what is not. What, then, is the true meaning of our involvement there? The Under Secretary of State answered:

We can properly understand the struggle in Vietnam only if we recognize it for what it is: part of a vast and continuing struggle in which we have been engaged for more than two decades.

Like most of the conflicts that have plagued the world in recent years, the conflict in Vietnam is a product of the great shifts and changes triggered by the Second World War.

Mr. Ball's subsequent analysis of this theme is compelling and informative and leads into this question which he asked:

Is the war in South Vietnam an external aggression from the North, or is it an indigenous revolt?

He points out that the Communists say it is only an indigenous rebellion, but the Under Secretary of State properly declares after further factual discourse:

It is clear beyond question that the war in South Vietnam has few of the attributes of an indigenous revolt. It is a cynical and systematic aggression by the North Vietnamese regime against the people of South Vietnam. It is one further chapter in the

February 7, 1966

ernment—particularly a thorough appreciation of the vital role of State government.

To accomplish this consideration should be given to establishing, at the executive level, a joint White House-Governors' Conference on Federal-State relationships.

I heartily endorse Governor Scranton's proposal for a joint White House-Governors' Conference on Intergovernmental Relations. It is an important proposal which I hope the President will accept because of the tremendous impact which proliferating new Federal programs are having upon our Federal system of government.

I have supported most of these new programs, particularly those which are designed to help the States and local governments attack the manifold problems ranging from mass transit to pollution which are confronting our burgeoning metropolitan areas. While recognizing the necessity for an enhanced role by our national government in dealing with the problems of our cities and metropolitan regions, I am concerned about a tendency in Washington to bypass the States and deal directly with city governments. The antipoverty program is a case in point.

The States are not obsolete units of government and should not be ignored or bypassed. I realize that in some past instances many States have been unwilling or unable to exercise their responsibilities in helping metropolitan areas cope with problems that are the result of our growing population and technological change. I wish to observe, however, that most problems confronting our metropolitan areas are not identical or uniform around the Nation and, for this reason, those units of government which are closer to the communities concerned are better equipped to deal with them.

Each unit of government in our federal system has a role to play in coping with these problems. The Federal Government should, wherever possible channel its funds through the State governments and should, wherever possible, give the States and localities an opportunity to administer these programs. The States should modernize their constitutions so that they can be better equipped to administer Federal programs and provide various services to the localities under their jurisdictions. State legislatures should be modernized and revitalized. A legislator's job is a full-time job in the States as well as in Washington; legislators should therefore be paid adequate salaries to attract able and dedicated men to public service and they should be given adequate office space and staff assistance so that they can discharge their growing responsibilities. States, through the extension of home rule and other measures, should strengthen local and county governments which, by law, are their creatures, so that these units of government can effectively carry out their share of the responsibility of providing the best in service to our metropolitan populations.

An important first step in the strengthening of the State and local wings of our Federal trinity can be the convening of a joint White House-Governors' Conference as proposed today by

Governor Scranton. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson announced his intention to appoint a commission to study our federal system with the aim of improving its operation. This is a commendable idea, but I think that Governor Scranton's proposal will result in a faster and farther advance to the objective mentioned by the President.

I might also call attention to the existence in Washington of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which was created by Congress in 1960 and which has representation from all three levels of government in our Federal system. The Commission and its staff could make a useful contribution to a White House conference such as the one urged by Governor Scranton.

Such a conference could also, as Governor Scranton pointed out, give serious consideration to the merits of a plan, originally proposed by former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Walter Heller to provide for the return to the States, with no strings attached, of a fixed portion of Federal tax revenue.

I have cosponsored a bill—S. 2619—which would implement Dr. Heller's proposal.

In closing, Mr. President, I urge President Johnson to give serious and sympathetic consideration to Governor Scranton's timely recommendation. The preservation and strengthening of our Federal system is one of the most important tasks facing those of us in government today.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of Governor Scranton's speech in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON AT THE NEW YORK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LUNCHEON, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 3, 1966

Nearly 200 years ago, 20 of your predecessors formed this chamber in response to an urgent need.

Rather than in a spirit of blind protest, they acted in recognition and acceptance of their responsibilities for constructive leadership in the colonial city of New York.

Since that time, as you well know, the New York Chamber of Commerce has established an honorable record of important service to the city and its citizens.

Today, with the quality of life in our great cities becoming a blur, the need for leadership from our business community is more pressing than ever.

A grave threat exists to the maintenance of our cities as traditional centers of commerce and industry, of intellectual achievement and culture, of progress and opportunity, of the good life.

The threat springs from the growing tyranny of machines and matter over the individual.

Nowhere is this more evident than in New York City with its "instant calamities," such as the mass transit strike, power blackout, and water shortage—and the constant menace of deterioration, congestion, and ugliness.

And nowhere are urban problems more urgently seeking solutions. The present and future condition of New York City are matters of universal concern.

For if the problems here in America's No. 1 metropolis are solved—it would be an enormous

impetus toward the solution of problems in every metropolitan area.

And these problems can be solved.

But it will take hard work and imaginative, progressive leadership by government at all levels and, most importantly, private individuals and groups.

You are fortunate in having now, as Mayor, an individual with the bright promise and potential of providing this kind of leadership. He has the inspiration and determination to succeed.

But he can't go it alone.

He will need your help.

I can cite Philadelphia and Pittsburgh in my own State as examples of what can be accomplished when business and industrial leaders fully accept their responsibilities.

The striking progress in revitalizing these two cities has been due largely to the initiative and efforts of these citizens.

Your new economic development council is a good beginning and should be of immense aid to John Lindsay as his full program for New York's revival matures. And, I am sure new opportunities for service to your city will present themselves.

When they do, I am equally sure that you will be ready for them.

For, in everything we do—in personal relationships, in business and industry, in our political system, in government at all levels, in our international posture—the identification, acceptance, and discharging of proper responsibilities is vital; and leadership is a precious resource.

In contrast to the past, today's enlightened business leaders have perceived that their trust, though private, extends to owners, customers, employees, and the general public alike. And your judgments reckon with the special concerns of each.

The fact that our Nation is now experiencing unprecedented economic growth and expansion is attributable in large measure to responsible business leadership. And to a much greater degree than the Federal publicity mills would have the public appreciate.

Our business community has earned the right to more credit and less abuse than has been the custom lately.

In Pennsylvania, we have fashioned our whole economic development program around one idea—only business and industry—not government—can create enduring jobs and prosperity. State government's responsibility is to see to it that business and industry can operate more profitably and pleasantly in Pennsylvania than anywhere else.

And we are making the idea work.

The same basic philosophy should apply at the national level.

To be sure, we have learned from the bitter experiences of the past that Government does have legitimate responsibilities for preserving our economic health.

However, in their enthusiasm for the new economics, the economists of the Great Society may be overreaching their responsibilities.

For we are seeing now an alarming increase in the influence of their stimulants, or depressants as the case may be, in what is still regarded, hopefully, as a free economy.

The policies and actions of the Federal Government now have a profound effect on our economy.

Tax rates and interest regulation, spending levels and wage and price control—whether overt or subtle—defense programs and even the health of the President all are reflected in an overly sensitive marketplace.

In the anxiety to avoid the mistakes of the past, the evolution of super government may be creating—not an invincible hero—but a threatening monster.

With overregulation comes overcontrol and disproportionate responsibility for our economic health.

Under these circumstances, the consequence of miscalculation, poor judgment, or

long and brutal chronicle of Communist efforts to extend the periphery of Communist power by force and terror. This point is at the heart of our determination to stay the course in the bloody contest now underway in South Vietnam. It also necessarily shapes our position with regard to negotiations.

Mr. Ball likewise effectively dispels the myth that—

The Vietcong—

The National Liberation Front—

has any color of claim as a political entity to represent (South Vietnamese) indigenous elements. The evidence makes clear that it (National Liberation Front) does not have such claim. It is purely and simply a fictitious organization created by Hanoi to reinforce a fiction. To recognize it as the representative of the South Vietnamese population would be to give legitimacy to that fiction. The true party in interest on the enemy side . . . is the North Vietnamese regime in Hanoi. And it is the failure of that regime to come to the bargaining table that has so frustrated every effort to move the problem of South Vietnam from a military to a political solution.

The able and experienced Under Secretary of State went on in his speech to point out:

We must resist every Communist effort to destroy by aggression the boundaries and demarcation lines established by the postwar arrangements. We cannot pick and choose among those boundaries. We cannot defend Berlin and yield Korea. We cannot recognize one commitment and repudiate another without tearing and weakening the entire structure on which the world's security depends.

I emphasize Mr. Ball's comment that he was not implying that postwar arrangements are sacrosanct and immutable because, as he said:

Some of the lines of demarcation drawn after the Second World War were explicitly provisional and were to be finally determined in political settlements yet to come. This was true in Germany, in Korea, and South Vietnam as well.

And I concur with the Under Secretary of State that—

These settlements not yet having been achieved, we cannot permit their resolution to be preempted by force. This is the issue in Vietnam. This is what we are fighting for. This is why we are there.

But it is reassuring to note that Mr. Ball declared emphatically:

We have no ambition to stay there any longer than necessary. We have made repeatedly clear that the United States seeks no territory in southeast Asia. We wish no military bases. We do not desire to destroy the regime in Hanoi or to remake it in a Western pattern. The United States will not retain American forces in South Vietnam once peace is assured.

The countries of southeast Asia can be nonaligned or neutral, depending on the will of the people. We support free elections in South Vietnam as soon as violence has been eliminated and the South Vietnamese people can vote without intimidation.

It seems to me that our Under Secretary of State, has clearly, forthrightly, and satisfactorily answered many pertinent questions concerning U.S. involvement and policy in Vietnam. There are, of course, other questions which continue unanswered or only partially answered,

so I would not infer that the need for discussion and debate is not present.

We also take hope from Mr. Ball's refutation of the assertion that China, through hundreds of years of history, has held sway over southeast Asia. This, he pointed out, "is simply not accurate," and he added:

Successive Chinese empires sought by force to establish such sway, but they never succeeded in doing so, except in certain sectors for limited periods. For the people of southeast Asia have, over the centuries, shown an obstinate insistence on shaping their own destiny which the Chinese have not been able to overcome.

And it is appropriate that the Under Secretary of State calls attention to the fact that—

A schism has developed within the Communist world. The Soviet Union has become the second greatest industrial power. The Soviet Union has come face to face with the realities of power and destruction in the nuclear age and has recognized the awesome fact that in the 20th century a war between great powers is a war without victory for anyone.

The changes taking place within the Soviet Union and among the nations of Eastern Europe are at once a reality and a promise.

And, Mr. President, let us trust that Mr. Ball is prophetic as well as hopeful in suggesting that—

Over time—and in a world of rapid and pervasive change the measurement of time is difficult indeed—we may look forward to a comparable development within Communist China—a maturing process that will deflect the policies of Peiping from bellicose actions to a peaceful relation with the rest of the world.

I commend and wish to be associated with the objective and hopeful remarks of Mr. Ball in the closing paragraphs of his admirable speech—especially with these excerpts which I emphasize:

In the long run, our hopes for the people of South Vietnam reflect our hopes for people everywhere. What we seek is a world living in peace and freedom—a world in which the cold war, with its tensions and conflicts, can recede into history. We are seeking to build a world in which men and nations will recognize and act upon a strongly shared interest in peace and international cooperation for the common good.

We should not despair of these objectives even though at the moment they may seem rather unreal and idealistic. For we would make a mistake to regard the cold war as a permanent phenomenon.

After all, it is not the American purpose simply to preserve the status quo. That was not our history and that is not our destiny. What we want to preserve is the freedom of choice for the peoples of the world. We will take our chances on that.

Mr. President, it is my judgment that the permanent record of the Congress should include the text of Under Secretary Ball's penetrating and illuminating speech on "The Hanoi Myth of an Indigenous Rebellion," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record substantially as it was published in the Sunday issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE HANOI MYTH OF AN INDIGENOUS REBELLION

(Speech by George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, delivered last week before the Northwestern University Alumni Association at Evanston, Ill.)

The beginning of wisdom with regard to Vietnam is to recognize that what Americans are fighting in the jungles and rice paddies of that unhappy land is not a local conflict—an isolated war that has meaning only for one part of the world.

We can properly understand the struggle in Vietnam only if we recognize it for what it is: part of a vast and continuing struggle in which we have been engaged for more than two decades.

Like most of the conflicts that have plagued the world in recent years, the conflict in Vietnam is a product of the great shifts and changes triggered by the Second World War. Out of the war, two continent-wide powers emerged: the United States and the Soviet Union. The colonial systems through which the nations of Western Europe had governed more than a third of the people of the world were, one by one, dismantled. The Soviet Union under Stalin embarked on a reckless course of seeking to extend Communist power. An iron curtain was erected to enclose large areas of the globe. At the same time, man was learning to harness the power of the exploding sun, and technology made mockery of time and distance.

The result of these vast changes—compressed within the breathless span of two decades—was to bring about a drastic rearrangement of the power structure of the world.

A WESTERN DAM

This rearrangement of power has resulted in a very uneasy equilibrium of forces. For even while the new national boundaries were still being marked on the map, the Soviet Union under Stalin exploited the confusion to push out the perimeter of its power and influence in an effort to extend the outer limits of Communist domination by force or the threat of force.

This process threatened the freedom of the world. It had to be checked and checked quickly. By launching the Marshall plan to restore economic vitality to the nations of Western Europe and by forming NATO—a powerful Western alliance reinforced by United States resources and military power—America and the free nations of Europe built a dam to hold back the further encroachment of Communist ambitions.

This decisive action succeeded brilliantly. NATO, created in 1949, stopped the spread of communism over Western Europe and the northern Mediterranean. But the world was given no time to relax. The victory of the Chinese Communists in that same year posed a new threat of Communist expansion against an Asia in ferment. Just as the Western World had mobilized its resistance against Communist force in Europe, we had to create an effective counterforce in the Far East if Communist domination were not to spread like a lava flow over the whole area.

BALANCE MAINTAINED

The first test came quickly in Korea. There the United Nations forces—predominantly American—stopped the drive of Communist North Korea, supported by matériel from the Soviet Union. They stopped a vast Chinese army that followed. They brought to a halt the Communist drive to push out the line that had been drawn and to establish Communist control over the whole Korean peninsula.

The Korean war was fought from a central conviction: that the best hope for freedom and security in the world depended on maintaining the integrity of the postwar

arrangements. Stability could be achieved only by making sure that the Communist world did not expand by destroying those arrangements by force and threat and thus upsetting the precarious power balance between the two sides of the Iron Curtain.

It was this conviction that led to our firm stand in Korea. It was this conviction that led America, in the years immediately after Korea, to build a barrier around the whole periphery of the Communist world by encouraging the creation of a series of alliances and commitments from the eastern edge of the NATO area to the Pacific.

The SEATO Treaty that was signed in 1954 was part of that barrier, that structure of alliances. It was ratified by the Senate by a vote of 82 to 1.

Under that treaty and its protocol, the United States and other treaty partners gave their joint and several pledges to guarantee existing boundaries—including the line of demarcation between North and South Vietnam established when the French relinquished their control over Indochina. Since then, three Presidents have reinforced that guarantee by further commitments given directly to the Republic of Vietnam. And on August 10, 1964, the Senate, by a vote of 88 to 2, and the House, by a vote of 416 to 0, adopted a joint resolution declaring their support for these commitments.

A GREEK ANALOGY

Today we are living up to those commitments by helping South Vietnam defend itself from the onslaught of Communist force—just as we helped Iran in 1946, Greece and Turkey in 1947, Formosa and Korea in 1950 and Berlin since 1948.

The bloody encounters in the highlands around Pleiku and the rice paddies of the Mekong Delta are thus in a real sense battles and skirmishes in a continuing war to prevent one Communist power after another from violating internationally recognized boundary lines fixing the outer limits of Communist dominion.

When we think of Vietnam, we think of Korea. In Vietnam, as in Korea, the Communists in one part of a divided country lying on the periphery of China have sought by force to gain dominion over the whole. But in terms of tactics on the ground, Greece is a closer analogy. For there, 20 years ago, as in South Vietnam today, the Communists sought to achieve their purpose by what is known in their lexicon as a war of national liberation.

They chose this method of aggression both in Greece and Vietnam because tactics of terror and sabotage, of stealth and subversion, give a great advantage to a disciplined and ruthless minority, particularly where—as in those two countries—the physical terrain made concealment easy and impeded the use of heavy weapons.

But the Communists also have a more subtle reason for favoring this type of aggression. It creates in any situation an element of confusion, a sense of ambiguity that can, they hope, so disturb and divide freemen as to prevent them from making common cause against it.

This ambiguity is the central point of debate in the discussions that have surrounded the South Vietnam problem.

SUBVERSION SINCE 1954

Is the war in South Vietnam an external aggression from the North or is it an indigenous revolt? This is a question that Americans quite properly ask—and one to which they deserve a satisfactory answer. It is a question which we who have official responsibilities have necessarily probed in great depth. For if the Vietnam war were merely what the Communists say it is—an indigenous rebellion—then the United States would have no business taking sides in the conflict and helping one side to defeat the other by force of arms.

The evidence on the character of the Vietnam war is voluminous. Its meaning seems clear enough: The North Vietnamese regime in Hanoi systematically created the Vietcong forces; it provides their equipment; it mounted the guerrilla war—and it controls that war from Hanoi on a day-to-day basis.

The evidence shows clearly enough that—at the time of French withdrawal—when Vietnam was divided in the settlement of 1954, the Communist regime in Hanoi never intended that South Vietnam should develop in freedom. Many Communists fighting with the Viet Minh army were directed to stay in the south, to cache away their arms and to do everything possible to undermine the South Vietnamese Government. Others—80,000 in all—were ordered to the North for training in the North Vietnamese army.

The evidence is clear enough also that the Communist rulers of the North resorted to guerrilla warfare in South Vietnam only when the success of the South Vietnam Government persuaded them that they could not achieve their designs by subversion alone.

In September 1960, the Lao Dong Party—the Communist Party in North Vietnam—held its Third Party Congress in Hanoi. That Congress called for the creation of a front organization to undertake the subversion of South Vietnam. Within 2 or 3 months thereafter, the National Liberation Front was established to provide a political facade for the conduct of an active guerrilla war.

NINE REGULAR REGIMENTS

Beginning early that year, the Hanoi regime began to infiltrate across the demarcation line the disciplined Communists whom the party had ordered north at the time of the settlement. In the intervening period since 1954, those men had been trained in the arts of proselytizing, sabotage, and subversion. Now they were ordered to conscript young men from the villages by force or persuasion and to form cadres around which guerrilla units could be built.

Beginning over a year ago, the Communists apparently exhausted their reservoir of southerners who had gone north. Since then, the greater number of men infiltrated into the south have been native-born North Vietnamese. Most recently, Hanoi has begun to infiltrate elements of the North Vietnamese Army in increasingly larger numbers. Today, these are evidence that nine regiments of regular North Vietnamese forces are fighting in organized units in the south.

I mention these facts—which are familiar enough to most of you—because they are fundamental to our policy with regard to Vietnam. These facts, it seems to us, make it clear beyond question that the war in South Vietnam has few of the attributes of an indigenous revolt. It is a cynical and systematic aggression by the North Vietnamese regime against the people of South Vietnam. It is one further chapter in the long and brutal chronicle of Communist efforts to extend the periphery of Communist power by force and terror.

UNACCEPTABLE CONDITION

This point is at the heart of our determination to stay the course in the bloody contest now underway in South Vietnam. It also necessarily shapes our position with regard to negotiations.

The President, Secretary Rusk and all spokesmen for the administration have stated again and again that the United States is prepared to join in unconditional discussions of the Vietnamese problem in an effort to bring about a satisfactory political solution. But so far, the regime in Hanoi has refused to come to the bargaining table except on the basis of quite unacceptable conditions. One among several such conditions—but one that has been widely debated in the United States—is that we must rec-

ognize the National Liberation Front as the representative—indeed, as the sole representative—of the South Vietnamese people.

Yet to recognize the National Liberation Front in such a capacity would do violence to the truth and betray the very people whose liberty we are fighting to secure. The National Liberation Front is not a political entity expressing the will of the people of South Vietnam—or any substantial element of the South Vietnamese population. It is a facade fabricated by the Hanoi regime to confuse the issue and elaborate the myth of an indigenous revolt.

History is not obscure on this matter. As I noted earlier, the creation of the Front was announced by the North Vietnam Communist Party—the Lao Dong Party—in 1960, soon after the North Vietnam military leader, General Giap, announced that “the north is the revolutionary base for the whole country.” But the Hanoi regime, while applauding its creation, has taken little pains to give the Front even the appearance of authenticity.

The individuals proclaimed as the leaders of the front are not personalities widely known to the South Vietnamese people—or, indeed, to many members of the Vietcong. They are not revolutionary heroes or national figures. They have little meaning to the ordinary Vietcong soldier who fights and dies in the jungles and rice paddies.

Instead, the names he carries into battle are those of “Uncle Ho”—Ho Chi Minh, the president of the North Vietnamese regime—and General Giap, its military hero. When Vietcong prisoners are asked during interrogation whether they are members of the National Liberation Front, they customarily reply that they owe allegiance to the Lao Dong—the Communist Party of North Vietnam—which is the equivalent of the Hanoi Communist regime.

The front, then, is unmistakably what its name implies: a Communist front organization created to mask the activities of Hanoi and to further the illusion of an indigenous revolt.

The name of the organization was carefully chosen. It bears the same name as the National Liberation Front of Algeria. But there the resemblance ends, for the Algerian front did, in fact, represent a substantial part of the Algerian population. It played a major role in an insurgency that was clearly an indigenous movement and not an aggression imposed from outside.

The Algerian front, moreover, commanded the respect and, indeed the obedience of the people. When it called a strike, the city of Algiers virtually closed down. By contrast, the front in Vietnam has shown its fictional character by revealing its own impotence. On two occasions it has called for a general strike. These calls have been totally ignored by the people of South Vietnam.

The Algerian front was a vital force in the Algerian community. It secured the overt allegiance of the old, established Moslem groups and leaders. As the revolt progressed, Moslems serving in the Algerian Assembly and even in the French Parliament announced their support for the front.

But the front in Vietnam has utterly failed in its efforts to attract the adherence of any established group within the society—whether Buddhist, Christian or any of the sects that form substantial elements in Vietnamese life.

Quite clearly, the people of South Vietnam—if they are aware of the front at all—know it for what it is: the political cover for a North Vietnamese effort to take over the south—in practical effect, the southern arm of the North Vietnamese Communist Party.

REINFORCING A FICTION

To be sure, the Vietcong military forces include a number of indigenous southerners

February 7, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2121

under northern control. Neither the United States nor the South Vietnamese Government has ever questioned that fact. But the composition of the Vietcong military forces is not the issue when one discusses the role of the front. The issue is whether the front has any color of claim as a political entity to represent these indigenous elements.

The evidence makes clear that it does not. It is purely and simply a fictitious organization created by Hanoi to reinforce a fiction. To recognize it as the representative of the South Vietnamese population would be to give legitimacy to that fiction.

The true party in interest on the enemy side—the entity that has launched the attack on the South Vietnamese Government for its own purposes, the entity that has created, controlled and supplied the fighting forces of the Vietcong from the beginning—is the North Vietnamese regime in Hanoi. And it is the failure of that regime to come to the bargaining table that has so far frustrated every effort to move the problem of South Vietnam from a military to a political solution.

In spite of these clear realities, we have not taken—nor do we take—an obdurate or unreasoning attitude with regard to the front. The President said in his state of the Union message, "We will meet at any conference table, we will discuss any proposals—4 points, or 14 or 40—and we will consider the views of any group"—and that, of course, includes the front along with other groups.

As the President has also said, this false issue of the Front would never prove "an insurmountable problem" if Hanoi were prepared for serious negotiations. But we cannot, to advance the political objectives of the Communist regime in Hanoi, give legitimacy to a spurious organization as though it spoke for the people of South Vietnam.

EVERY BOUNDARY IMPORTANT

A European friend once critically observed that Americans have "a sense of mission but no sense of history." That accusation is, I think, without warrant.

We do have a sense of history and it is that which enables us to view the war in South Vietnam for what it is. We Americans know that it is not, as I have said earlier, a local conflict; it is part of a continuing struggle to prevent the Communists from upsetting the fragile balance of power through force or the threat of force.

To succeed in that struggle, we must resist every Communist effort to destroy by aggression the boundaries and demarcation lines established by the postwar arrangements. We cannot pick and choose among those boundaries. We cannot defend Berlin and yield Korea. We cannot recognize one commitment and repudiate another without tearing and weakening the entire structure on which the world's security depends.

Some thoughtful critics of our Vietnamese policy both in Europe and America challenge this. They maintain that the West should not undertake to defend the integrity of all lines of demarcation even though they may be underwritten in formal treaties. They contend that many of these lines are unnatural since they do not conform to the geopolitical realities as they see them. They contend in particular that—since the passing of colonialism—the Western Powers have no business mixing in the affairs of the Asian mainland. They imply that—regardless of our commitments—we should not try to prevent Red China from establishing its hegemony over the east Asian land mass south of the Soviet Union.

INACCURATE PREMISE

Proponents of this view advance two principal arguments to support their thesis.

They contend that the very weight of Chinese power, its vast population, and its consequent ability to mobilize immense mass

armies entitles it to recognition as the controlling force of southeast Asia.

As a second reason for acknowledging the Chinese hegemony, they contend that for centuries China has maintained a dominant cultural and political influence throughout the area.

They claim, therefore, that southeast Asia lies within the Chinese sphere of influence and that we should let the Chinese redraw the lines of demarcation to suit themselves without regard to the wishes of the southeast Asian people.

This argument, it seems to me, does not provide an acceptable basis for U.S. policy.

The assertion that China through hundreds of years of history has held sway over southeast Asia is simply not accurate. Successive Chinese empires sought by force to establish such sway, but they never succeeded in doing so, except in certain sectors for limited periods. For the people of southeast Asia have, over the centuries, shown an obstinate insistence on shaping their own destiny which the Chinese have not been able to overcome.

To adopt the sphere-of-influence approach now advocated would, therefore, not mean allowing history to repeat itself. It would mean according to China a status it had never been able to achieve by its own efforts throughout the ages. It would mean sentencing the peoples of southeast Asia against their will to indefinite servitude behind the Bamboo Curtain. And it would mean turning our back on the principles that have formed the basis of Western policy in the whole postwar era.

Nor can one seriously insist that geographical propinquity establishes the Chinese right to dominate. At a time when man can circle the earth in 90 minutes, there is little to support such a literal commitment to 19th century geopolitics. It is a dubious policy that would permit the accidents of geography to deprive peoples of their right to determine their own future free from external force. The logic of that policy has dark implications. It would rationalize the greed of great powers. It would imperil the prospects for developing and maintaining an equilibrium of power in the world.

The principles of the United Nations Charter are doctrinally more in tune with the aspirations of 20th century man.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

This does not mean, however, that the political shape of the world should be regarded as frozen in an intractable pattern; that the boundaries established by the postwar arrangements are necessarily sacrosanct and immutable. Indeed, some of the lines of demarcation drawn after the Second World War were explicitly provisional and were to be finally determined in political settlements yet to come. This was true in Germany, in Korea, and South Vietnam as well.

But those settlements have not yet been achieved, and we cannot permit their resolution to be preempted by force. This is the issue in Vietnam. This is what we are fighting for. This is why we are there.

We have no ambition to stay there any longer than is necessary. We have made repeatedly clear that the United States seeks no territory in Southeast Asia. We wish no military bases. We do not desire to destroy the regime in Hanoi or to remake it in a Western pattern. The United States will not retain American forces in South Vietnam once peace is assured.

The countries of southeast Asia can be nonaligned or neutral, depending on the will of the people. We support free elections in South Vietnam as soon as violence has been eliminated and the South Vietnamese people can vote without intimidation. We look forward to free elections—and we will accept the result as a democratic people is accustomed to do. Yet we have little doubt

about the outcome, for we are confident that the South Vietnamese who have fought hard for their freedom will not be the first people to give up that freedom to communism in a free exercise of self-determination.

Whether the peoples of the two parts of Vietnam will wish to unite is again for them to decide as soon as they are in a position to do so freely. Like other options, that of reunification must be preserved.

A SHARED INTEREST

In the long run, our hopes for the people of South Vietnam reflect our hopes for people everywhere. What we seek is a world living in peace and freedom—a world in which the cold war, with its tensions and conflicts, can recede into history. We are seeking to build a world in which men and nations will recognize and act upon a strongly shared interest in peace and international cooperation for the common good.

We should not despair of these objectives even though at the moment they may seem rather unreal and idealistic. For we would make a mistake to regard the cold war as a permanent phenomenon. After all, it was less than two decades ago that Winston Churchill first announced in Fulton, Mo., that "from Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an Iron curtain has descended across the Continent." And two decades are only a moment in the long sweep of history.

During the intervening years, major changes have taken place on both sides of the Iron Curtain. A schism has developed within the Communist world. The Soviet Union has become the second greatest industrial power. The Soviet people have begun to acquire a stake in the status quo, and after the missile crisis of 1962 the Soviet Union has come face to face with the realities of power and destruction in the nuclear age and has recognized the awesome fact that in the 20th century a war between great powers is a war without victory for anyone.

The changes taking place within the Soviet Union and among the nations of Eastern Europe are at once a reality and a promise.

Over time—and in a world of rapid and pervasive change the measurement of time is difficult indeed—we may look forward to a comparable development within Communist China—a maturing progress that will deflect the policies of Peiping from bellicose actions to a peaceful relation with the rest of the world.

After all, it is not the American purpose simply to preserve the status quo. That was not our history and that is not our destiny. What we want to preserve is the freedom of choice for the peoples of the world. We will take our chances on that.

EFFORTS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, JAMES M. QUIGLEY, TO MEET PROBLEMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, a year ago the Federal Government took an important step in the effort to eliminate discrimination in health care in the United States.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states:

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

In January 1965 the Federal Government required nearly 19,000 hospitals, health clinics and nursing homes that receive Federal financial assistance to

submit an "Assurance of Compliance," or else face withholding of Federal funds in the manner set forth by Congress.

By containing legally enforceable pledges of nondiscrimination from their grantees, Federal agencies are carrying out the congressional mandate to end all forms of racial segregation, discrimination, or distinctive treatment in federally aided activities.

Until recently, the Federal official most responsible for enforcing title VI in the health field was Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare James M. Quigley. Assistant Secretary Jim Quigley, a former colleague of ours in Congress, has now moved out of his civil rights role to concentrate on the problems of water and air pollution. But he has set the civil rights administrative framework for title VI compliance in the Department of HEW, and he has earned the thanks of all citizens concerned with racial justice and harmony.

The challenge to Secretary Quigley and the Department was to secure compliance through administrative, voluntary, or legal means. Thousands of institutions submitted assurances. Five hundred and sixty-five State agencies, chiefly in health and in welfare programs, negotiated statements of compliance, thereby becoming civil rights copartners with the Federal agencies.

Under Jim Quigley's direction, the Department used several medical care compliance routes; regular and pregranting program reviews for fund applicants as under the Hill-Burton—hospital construction—and highlighting a breakthrough for Federal antidiscrimination activity, the formation of a compliance program whereby not only health fund recipients but entire communities, including civil rights organizations, are brought together, given an explanation of title VI, and asked to work in unity to help discriminating institutions comply with the act. This gamble on local community involvement in health and welfare compliance efforts was new for HEW. It is working, however, in two ways: discrimination issues are being resolved at local levels and compliance, to the benefit of all concerned parties, is more uniformly achieved.

Through December 1965, HEW had received approximately 500 complaints alleging title VI violations. Of these, 325 were on hospitals, mostly in the South. Nearly all allegations proved correct. For, while "colored" and "white" signs were down, hospitals in fact had segregated waiting rooms, wards, services, and so forth, and in a few cases white nurses did not serve Negro patients; and, in many localities qualified Negro physicians, systematically excluded by race from local medical societies, were denied hospital staff privileges. These conditions were so prevailing that onsite Federal reviews attested the existence of widespread discrimination in countless other hospitals not included in complaint allegations.

As a result of the compliance program directed by Mr. Quigley, the picture is changing. Over 100 alleged hospital

violators of title VI have, after Federal negotiations, complied in full with the law. Negroes and whites are now serviced in turn in these hospitals or on a patient-need basis and share the same semiprivate rooms. Also, in these institutions qualified Negro physicians attain staff privileges. It is anticipated that another 175 hospitals complained against will soon be in line. Hospitals in various regions have publicly announced total compliance, although no violations were alleged; and State welfare agencies have stopped using more than 100 hospitals which refused to assure nondiscrimination.

Yet, although the administrative framework for full compliance is set, comprehensive action to carry out title VI in medical facilities is just underway. Federal attention must now focus on helping State agencies to get real, not just paper, compliance in the hundreds of institutions or clinics they use. The executive branch must also guarantee that institutions participating in medicare, which starts in July 1966, operate without discrimination.

As the Federal agency most involved with title VI, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is committed to help eliminate racial discrimination from the Nation. Under Jim Quigley's guidance the Department made a strong start toward uprooting discrimination from U.S. hospitals and in providing equal medical treatment to all citizens. I am hopeful that these efforts will continue and expand under his successors, now that he is devoting his full time to the national problems of water and air pollution issues, on which he is one of America's leading experts.

I ask unanimous consent that several newspaper reports, which discuss the views of Secretary Quigley and his efforts to meet the discrimination problem, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, May 3, 1965]

But in a statement to U.S. News & World Report, Mr. Quigley added:

"If all of us do our jobs in good faith and do them well, not 1 cent of this money will be withheld.

"The purpose of title VI [of the Civil Rights Act of 1964] is not to cut off funds, but to eliminate discrimination. This is the purpose we seek to accomplish."

Mr. Quigley said he believes, "public interest in title VI too often focuses on its negative aspects—the authorization to withhold Federal funds from institutions not complying with the act.

"HEW aims to carry out title VI as intended by Congress—neither to penalize the conscientious nor reward the cavalier," Mr. Quigley noted.

"The responsibility of the Federal official under title VI is both exacting and clear—secure compliance with the Civil Rights Act."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 2, 1965]

FEDERAL AGENCY MOVES TO HALT BIAS IN HOSPITALS

WASHINGTON, September 1.—The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare announced plans today for stepping up enforcement of the law against racial discrimi-

nation in more than 19,000 hospital and other health facilities.

James M. Quigley, Assistant Secretary, said these institutions would be required to submit detailed reports on what they have done to comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VI prohibits discrimination in any federally assisted program.

These reports, Mr. Quigley said, "will be spot-checked by compliance visits by the HEW staff from coast to coast." About 9,000 hospitals, 9,700 nursing homes, and an undetermined number of diagnostic treatment centers are covered by the act.

In addition, staff members who visit hospitals periodically will be trained to look for discrimination and report any violation. Plans for new hospitals will be examined to screen out separate facilities for the races.

REGULATIONS ISSUED

The Department has issued regulations for compliance and has had teams investigating complaints. Civil rights groups, however, have accused the Department of lax enforcement.

A recent complaint by the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., said the Department's "continued failure to cut off funds has permitted many institutions to conclude that title VI is only a paper tiger."

Since the law was enacted last year, the Department has received 225 complaints against hospitals. Of these, 40 have been resolved in compliance and the remainder are "in the process of negotiation." In none of the cases have steps been taken to cut off Federal funds.

"All of us are trying very hard to avoid the necessity of doing this," Mr. Quigley said. "The idea is not to cut off money—it is to bring equal rights to all our citizens."

Plans for stepping up enforcement were announced by Mr. Quigley in an address delivered today to the American Hospital Association in San Francisco, the text of which was made available here.

FORM ASKS 58 QUESTIONS

Mr. Quigley said a compliance report form will be sent to every hospital and medical facility in the country.

"This form asks about 50 questions," he said. "It will show hospital administrators all over the country precisely what is meant by compliance; and it will tell us the hospitals which are not yet complying."

Virtually every hospital and medical facility in the country receives Federal aid in some form.

Most of the complaints have come from the South, Mr. Quigley said, and nearly every complaint was found to be valid. But he said that hospitals in many racially tense communities had "totally discarded discriminatory practices." He named Birmingham and Tuscaloosa, Ala., Jackson, Miss., Macon, Ga., and Blytheville, Ark.

"In each of these communities Negroes are sharing hospital rooms with white persons, Negro nurses are supervising white nurses and Negro doctors are serving patients of both races," Mr. Quigley said.

"I have the distinct impression that there is now less discrimination in those southern hospitals, which we have brought into full compliance with the law, in response to complaints, than there is in many hospitals in the North, East, and the West."

EXAMPLES ARE LISTED

Mr. Quigley listed these examples of attempts to evade the law:

No Negro babies were placed in the nursery of one hospital, the staff said, because all Negro mothers preferred to nurse their babies—therefore, all Negro babies were "roomed in" with their mothers.

One administrator said he could integrate his hospital in a week but it would take years before he could train his employees to write Mr., Mrs., or Miss before the name of a Negro patient on the medical chart.

can War Veterans of the United States, in Philadelphia, Pa., on November 20, 1965.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

A statement by him on the birthday anniversary of Thaddeus Kosciusko.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Material relative to 1966 Book-of-the-Month Club Library Award which was won by the Hardy County Public Library.

"FIGURES DON'T LIE"—CUTBACK IN SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM WILL REDUCE MILK CONSUMPTION IN OUR SCHOOLS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today I refer to yet another study which shows that the administration's ill-advised cutback in the special milk program for schoolchildren will reduce milk consumption in our schools. I have spoken out daily on the floor of the Senate against this false economy which saves no money but will penalize families with school-age children without reducing Government expenditures.

This study was carried out by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in 1955. It was conducted in Madison and Milwaukee, the capital city and the largest city, respectively, in my State of Wisconsin. The study measured the impact a decrease in the cost of milk to the schoolchildren themselves would have on consumption. It is pertinent to this discussion because an increase in the price of milk to these same schoolchildren, which the Department of Agriculture has admitted will result from its plans to redirect—I call it "cripple"—the school milk program, will have the reverse effect.

The study showed that a price reduction per half pint from 4 to 3 cents increased consumption in Madison by 41.8 percent; in Milwaukee by 10.5 percent. A price reduction from 4 to 1 cents increased consumption in Madison by a whopping 158.8 percent; in Milwaukee by 82.6 percent.

Mr. BASS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for the effort he is making in behalf of continued adequate supplies of milk for schoolchildren in America. I join him in the hope that an adequate supply of milk can be continued without curtailment, and that the money can be provided to assure that every child in America who desires to have a glass of milk during school hours may have it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the support of the Senator from Tennessee, and I thank him for his remarks.

Here were some of the conclusions of the study:

First. The greater the price reduction, the greater was the increase in consumption.

Second. In Madison schools, additional times of service was an important factor in stimulating milk consumption, especially in those schools where the percentage reduction in price was small. I think this is a point to be emphasized, Mr. President, because the Department seems to feel that serving milk in mid-

morning and midafternoon is not very important where you have a school lunch program. This study shows that such servings appreciably increase consumption.

Third. A mail survey of Madison housewives indicated that most of the increased milk consumption at school was new consumption, not the replacement of home consumption. This means, of course, that a reduction in consumption as a result of the slash in the school milk program will not be made up at home.

Mr. President, I believe the Department of Agriculture would do well to study its own reports before it decides to cripple the school milk program. The reports show without exception that such a move would be a real disservice to America's schoolchildren.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS AGAIN PAYS OFF WITH BIG SOUTH AMERICAN PER CAPITA INCOME BOOST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, tucked away in the back of yesterday's papers was a story of great significance for a South America of free non-Communist economies.

Estimates by U.S. economists show that this year—for the second year in a row—South American countries seem set to surpass the target of progress set for them under the Alliance for Progress.

There is deep and proper concern that the population growth of these countries is eating up any economic progress that may be making. Population pressure is indeed a problem. But allowing for this pressure, the good news is that the hemisphere aim of achieving a per capita increase of 2.5 percent will once again be met and passed. Estimates put the per capita growth in average income at 2.7 percent.

As I said, Mr. President, this allows for population increase. Overall production will go up by an impressive \$75 billion in 1966, or 5.6 percent as compared with last year.

This suggests that the \$2 billion a year which Congress appropriates is turning out to be a good investment.

The record on each of the seven large countries is specially impressive. Argentina shows an increase of 5 percent, Brazil 6 percent, Chile 5 percent, Colombia 5½ percent, Mexico 6½ percent, Peru 5½ percent, and Venezuela 6 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from yesterday's issue of the Washington Post setting out and expanding on the figures I have quoted be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

INCOME FOR 1965 TO SURPASS LATIN GOAL

Preliminary estimates by U.S. economists indicated yesterday that for the second successive year Latin America's economic growth will surpass the target set under the Alliance for Progress.

That 10-year program for social and economic progress in this hemisphere aims at boosting average individual incomes by at least 2.5 percent a year.

According to preliminary forecasts made

available here, the 19 Latin American Republics are likely to record in 1966 an average income increase of 2.7 percent per person.

This compares with a 2.8 percent per capita income rise reported for 1965 and a 2.4 percent increase in 1964.

Overall production is expected to climb even more, as measured in constant 1962 (first year of the Alliance program) dollars. The gross national product of the 19 nations was tentatively forecast at \$75.57 billion in 1966, a 5.6 percent boost above last year.

Latin America's gross national product—a total value of goods and services—rose 5.7 percent in 1965 and 5.3 percent in 1964. However, the per person increase has been less than half this percentage because of rapidly expanding populations.

The new statistics are being read with considerable pleasure in Washington, which supplies some \$2 billion a year to aid the Alliance program.

About 88 percent of the gross national product is found in 7 of the 19 countries: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela. The preliminary estimates on these countries show up this way:

	1966 GNP (billions)	Percent increase over 1965	1966 GNP per capita
Argentina.....	\$12.23	5.0	\$564
Brazil.....	15.26	6.0	180
Chile.....	4.13	5.0	474
Colombia.....	5.40	5.5	309
Mexico.....	18.90	6.5	449
Peru.....	3.09	5.5	257
Venezuela.....	7.37	6.0	811

The 19-republic total does not include Communist Cuba, which is not a member of the program.

THE HANOI MYTH OF AN INDIGENOUS REBELLION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, recently the Under Secretary of State, George W. Ball, made a speech before the Northwestern University Alumni Association in Evanston, Ill. It is entitled "The Hanoi Myth of an Indigenous Rebellion." I thought it was one of the best overall statements I had seen concerning why we are in Vietnam. It contains a background of the other actions taken by us for the same general purposes as our purpose in being there.

Mr. Ball's concluding paragraph was as follows:

After all, it is not the American purpose simply to preserve the status quo. That was not our history and that is not our destiny. What we want to preserve is the freedom of choice for the peoples of the world. We will take our chances on that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Ball's speech, as printed in yesterday's issue of the Washington Post, be printed in the Record at this point. It is one of the best articles I have seen on this general subject.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE HANOI MYTH OF AN INDIGENOUS REBELLION

(Speech by Hon. George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, before the Northwestern University Alumni Association at Evanston, Ill.)

The beginning of wisdom with regard to Vietnam is to recognize that what Americans are fighting in the jungles and rice paddies of that unhappy land is not a local

The items to which section 2 of the bill alludes, and which authorizes these cooperative agreements, are three in number. One is the two-room frame building which served as the first capitol of the Indiana Territory. From 1800 to 1813 the territorial court and council chamber met here, making vital decisions on land policy, Indian relations, and military affairs for the area which was to produce the States of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and part of Minnesota. The building is now owned and administered by the State of Indiana.

The second is the William Henry Harrison mansion, Grouseland. Harrison, later the Nation's ninth President, was first Governor of Indiana Territory, a post he held from 1800 to 1812. The 26-room building, dating from 1803-04, is believed to have been designed by Harrison himself in Georgian style, the Territory's first brick building. Owned by the Daughters of the American Revolution, it was designated as a registered national historic landmark in 1961.

The third additional historic property which would become a cooperative part of the new historical park is the St. Francis Xavier Catholic Church. This old cathedral, the third building on the same church site, was built in 1824-34 and is a reminder of the spread of religion in the Northwest by the explorer missionaries who first built a rude log structure here in 1749.

Vincennes in this early period was the western outpost of the Nation. The taking of what was then Fort Sackville at Vincennes by George Rogers Clark in 1779, together with his other military operations in the area, made an important contribution to the outcome of the Revolutionary War and the establishment of American control in the Northwest. Clark surprised the British at Fort Sackville by a tremendously difficult mid-winter march of 180 miles, largely across flooded lands and without sufficient food, following his capture of the French-held Kaskaskia on the Mississippi River by his 150-man force. Clark, who had been commissioned a lieutenant colonel by Gov. Patrick Henry and whose troops were supported by his native Virginia, renamed the fort "Patrick Henry."

Mr. President, I am delighted by the support which has been indicated from the Department of the Interior and by the prospect of making this excellent addition to our national park system.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2886) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation by the State of Indiana of the George Rogers Clark Memorial for establishment as the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. BAYH), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

USE OF NUCLEAR POWER IN LAND, SEA, AND AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I introduce a joint resolution which in effect provides for an investigation and study in order to determine means to encourage and promote the use of nuclear power in land, sea, air, and space transportation. The purpose of the joint resolution is based upon the fact that there is no coordination or correlation between the potential of the use of atomic power in all transportation fields. The Senator from Rhode Island and I, and many other Senators, believe that the time has come to move forward on a coordinated basis to investigate the possibilities in this field.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 136) to provide for an investigation and study in order to determine means to encourage and promote the use of nuclear power in land, sea, air, and space transportation, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. PASTORE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on January 26, S. 2824, a bill for the relief of the Southwest Gas Equipment Co., Inc., was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from its further consideration, and the bill referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators DOUGLAS, HARTKE, and JORDAN of Idaho be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 130) to establish May 8-14, 1966, as National School Safety Patrol Week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, near the end of the first session Senators CARLSON, METCALF, and I joined in submitting a resolution (S. Con. Res. 64) to provide for creation of an Atlantic Union delegation.

We are pleased that a number of other Senators have indicated their desire to sponsor this resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators BARTLETT, BASS, DODD, FANNIN, FONG,

GRUENING, HARTKE, INOUE, JAVITS, LAUSCHE, MOSS, PROUTY, PELL, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey be added to the list of cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 64, and that their names be listed among the sponsors at the next printing of the concurrent resolutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of January 28, 1966:

S. 2845. A bill to provide for the selection of qualified persons to serve as jurors in each U.S. district court without regard to their race or color: Mr. FONG.

S. 2846. A bill to protect civil rights by providing that it shall be a Federal offense to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any of his civil rights; by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence; and for other purposes: Mr. FONG and Mr. SCOTT.

Authority of February 2, 1966:

S. 2860. A bill to increase the basic pay of enlisted members of the uniformed services in the lowest four pay grades with not more than 2 years of service: Mr. SCOTT.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8126) to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MULTER, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. NELSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 30) to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT:

Address delivered by Col. Saul Fromkes, president of the City Title Insurance Co., at a testimonial dinner for Anthony V. Lo Popolo, national commander, Italian-Ameri-

conflict—an isolated war that has meaning only for one part of the world.

We can properly understand the struggle in Vietnam only if we recognize it for what it is: part of a vast and continuing struggle in which we have been engaged for more than two decades.

Like most of the conflicts that have plagued the world in recent years, the conflict in Vietnam is a product of the great shifts and changes triggered by the Second World War. Out of the war, two continent-wide powers emerged: the United States and the Soviet Union. The colonial customs through which the nations of Western Europe had governed more than a third of the people of the world were, one by one, dismantled. The Soviet Union under Stalin embarked on a reckless course of seeking to extend Communist power. An Iron Curtain was erected to enclose large areas of the globe. At the same time, man was learning to harness the power of the exploding sun, and technology made mockery of time and distance.

The result of these vast changes—compressed within the breathless span of two decades—was to bring about a drastic rearrangement of the power structure of the world.

A WESTERN DAM

This rearrangement of power has resulted in a very uneasy equilibrium of forces. For even while the new national boundaries were still being marked on the map, the Soviet Union under Stalin exploited the confusion to push out the perimeter of its power and influence in an effort to extend the outer limits of Communist domination by force or the threat of force.

This process threatened the freedom of the world. It had to be checked and checked quickly. By launching the Marshall plan to restore economic vitality to the nations of Western Europe and by forming NATO—a powerful Western alliance reinforced by U.S. resources and military power—America and the free nations of Europe built a dam to hold back the further encroachment of Communist ambitions.

This decisive action succeeded brilliantly. NATO, created in 1949, stopped the spread of communism over Western Europe and the northern Mediterranean. But the world was given no time to relax. The victory of the Chinese Communists in that same year posed a new threat of Communist expansion against an Asia in ferment. Just as the Western world had mobilized its resistance against Communist force in Europe, we had to create an effective counterforce in the Far East if Communist domination were not to spread like a lava flow over the whole area.

BALANCE MAINTAINED

The first test came quickly in Korea. There the United Nations forces—predominantly American—stopped the drive of Communist North Korea, supported by materiel from the Soviet Union. They stopped a vast Chinese army that followed. They brought to a halt the Communist drive to push out the line that had been drawn and to establish Communist control over the whole Korean peninsula.

The Korean war was fought from a central conviction: that the best hope for freedom and security in the world depended on maintaining the integrity of the postwar arrangements. Stability could be achieved only by making sure that the Communist world did not expand by destroying those arrangements by force and threat and thus upsetting the precarious power balance between the two sides of the Iron Curtain.

It was this conviction that led to our firm stand in Korea. It was this conviction that led America, in the years immediately after Korea, to build a barrier around the whole periphery of the Communist world by encouraging the creation of a series of alliances

and commitments from the eastern edge of the NATO area to the Pacific.

The SEATO treaty that was signed in 1954 was part of that barrier, that structure of alliances. It was ratified by the Senate by a vote of 82 to 1.

Under that treaty and its protocol, the United States and other treaty partners gave their joint and several pledges to guarantee existing boundaries—including the line of demarcation between North and South Vietnam established when the French relinquished their control over Indochina. Since then, three Presidents have reinforced that guarantee by further commitments given directly to the Republic of Vietnam. And on August 10, 1964, the Senate, by a vote of 88 to 2, and the House, by a vote of 416 to 0, adopted a joint resolution declaring their support for these commitments.

A GREEK ANALOGY

Today we are living up to those commitments by helping South Vietnam defend itself from the onslaught of Communist force—just as we helped Iran in 1946, Greece and Turkey in 1947, Formosa and Korea in 1950, and Berlin since 1948.

The bloody encounters in the highlands around Pleiku and the rice paddies of the Mekong Delta are thus in a real sense battles and skirmishes in a continuing war to prevent one Communist power after another from violating internationally recognized boundary lines fixing the outer limits of Communist dominion.

When we think of Vietnam, we think of Korea. In Vietnam, as in Korea, the Communists in one part of a divided country lying on the periphery of China have sought by force to gain dominion over the whole. But in terms of tactics on the ground, Greece is a closer analogy. For there, 20 years ago, as in South Vietnam today, the Communists sought to achieve their purpose by what is known in their lexicon as a "war of national liberation."

They chose this method of aggression both in Greece and Vietnam because tactics of terror and sabotage, of stealth and subversion, give a great advantage to a disciplined and ruthless minority, particularly where—as in those two countries—the physical terrain made concealment easy and impeded the use of heavy weapons.

But the Communists also have a more subtle reason for favoring this type of aggression. It creates in any situation an element of confusion, a sense of ambiguity that can, they hope, so disturb and divide freemen as to prevent them from making common cause against it.

This ambiguity is the central point of debate in the discussions that have surrounded the South Vietnam problem.

SUBVERSION SINCE 1954

Is the war in South Vietnam an external aggression from the north, or is it an indigenous revolt? This is a question that Americans quite properly ask—and one to which they deserve a satisfactory answer. It is a question which we who have official responsibilities have necessarily probed in great depth. For if the Vietnam war were merely what the Communists say it is—an indigenous rebellion—then the United States would have no business taking sides in the conflict and helping one side to defeat the other by force of arms.

The evidence on the character of the Vietnam war is voluminous. Its meaning seems clear enough: The North Vietnamese regime in Hanoi systematically created the Vietcong forces; it provides their equipment; it mounted the guerrilla war—and it controls that war from Hanoi on a day-to-day basis.

The evidence shows clearly enough that—at the time of French withdrawal—when Vietnam was divided in the settlement of 1954, the Communist regime in Hanoi never intended that South Vietnam should develop

in freedom. Many Communists fighting with the Vietminh Army were directed to stay in the south, to cache away their arms and to do everything possible to undermine the South Vietnamese Government. Others—80,000 in all—were ordered to the north for training in the North Vietnamese Army.

The evidence is clear enough also that the Communist rulers of the north resorted to guerrilla warfare in South Vietnam only when the success of the South Vietnam Government persuaded them that they could not achieve their designs by subversion alone.

In September 1960, the Lao Dong Party—the Communist Party in North Vietnam—held its third party congress in Hanoi. That congress called for the creation of a front organization to undertake the subversion of South Vietnam. Within 2 or 3 months thereafter, the National Liberation Front was established to provide a political facade for the conduct of an active guerrilla war.

NINE REGULAR REGIMENTS

Beginning early that year, the Hanoi regime began to infiltrate across the demarcation line the disciplined Communists whom the party had ordered north at the time of the settlement. In the intervening period since 1954, those men had been trained in the arts of proselytizing, sabotage, and subversion. Now they were ordered to conscript young men from the villages by force or persuasion and to form cadres around which guerrilla units could be built.

Beginning over a year ago, the Communists apparently exhausted their reservoir of southerners who had gone north. Since then, the greater number of men infiltrated into the south have been native-born North Vietnamese. Most recently, Hanoi has begun to infiltrate elements of the North Vietnamese Army in increasingly larger numbers. Today, there is evidence that nine regiments of regular North Vietnamese forces are fighting in organized units in the south.

I mention these facts—which are familiar enough to most of you—because they are fundamental to our policy with regard to Vietnam. These facts, it seems to us, make it clear beyond question that the war in South Vietnam has few of the attributes of an indigenous revolt. It is a cynical and systematic aggression by the North Vietnamese regime against the people of South Vietnam. It is one further chapter in the long and brutal chronicle of Communist efforts to extend the periphery of Communist power by force and terror.

UNACCEPTABLE CONDITION

This point is at the heart of our determination to stay the course in the bloody contest now underway in South Vietnam. It also necessarily shapes our position with regard to negotiations.

The President, Secretary Rusk, and all spokesmen for the administration have stated again and again that the United States is prepared to join in unconditional discussions of the Vietnamese problem in an effort to bring about a satisfactory political solution. But so far, the regime in Hanoi has refused to come to the bargaining table except on the basis of quite unacceptable conditions. One among several such conditions—but one that has been widely debated in the United States—is that we must recognize the National Liberation Front as the representative—indeed, as the sole representative—of the South Vietnamese people.

Yet to recognize the National Liberation Front in such a capacity would do violence to the truth and betray the very people whose liberty we are fighting to secure. The National Liberation Front is not a political entity expressing the will of the people of South Vietnam—or any substantial element of the South Vietnamese population. It is a facade fabricated by the Hanoi regime to confuse

the issue and elaborate the myth of an indigenous revolt.

History is not obscure on this matter. As I noted earlier, the creation of the Front was announced by the North Vietnam Communist Party—the Lao Dong Party—in 1960, soon after the North Vietnam military leader, General Giap, announced that “the North is the revolutionary base for the whole country.” But the Hanoi regime, while applauding its creation, has taken little pains to give the Front even the appearance of authenticity.

The individuals proclaimed as the leaders of the Front are not personalities widely known to the South Vietnamese people—or, indeed, to many members of the Vietcong. They are not revolutionary heroes or national figures. They have little meaning to the ordinary Vietcong soldier who fights and dies in the jungles and rice paddies.

Instead, the names he carries into battle are those of “Uncle Ho”—Ho Chi Minh, the president of the North Vietnamese regime—and General Giap, its military hero. When Vietcong prisoners are asked during interrogation whether they are members of the National Liberation Front, they customarily reply that they owe allegiance to the Lao Dong—the Communist Party of North Vietnam—which is the equivalent of the Hanoi Communist regime.

The Front, then, is unmistakably what its name implies: a Communist front organization created to mask the activities of Hanoi and to further the illusion of an indigenous revolt.

The name of the organization was carefully chosen. It bears the same name as the National Liberation Front of Algeria. But there the resemblance ends, for the Algerian Front did, in fact, represent a substantial part of the Algerian population. It played a major role in an insurgency that was clearly an indigenous movement and not an aggression imposed from outside.

The Algerian Front, moreover, commanded the respect and, indeed, the obedience of the people. When it called a strike, the city of Algiers virtually closed down. By contrast, the Front in Vietnam has shown its fictional character by revealing its own impotence. On two occasions it has called for a general strike. These calls have been totally ignored by the people of South Vietnam.

The Algerian Front was a vital force in the Algerian community. It secured the overt allegiance of the old, established Moslem groups and leaders. As the revolt progressed, Moslems serving in the Algerian Assembly and even in the French Parliament announced their support for the Front.

But the Front in Vietnam has utterly failed in its efforts to attract the adherence of any established group within the society—whether Buddhist, Christian or any of the sects that form substantial elements in Vietnamese life.

Quite clearly, the people of South Vietnam—if they are aware of the Front at all—know it for what it is: the political cover for a North Vietnamese effort to take over the South—in practical effect, the southern arm of the North Vietnamese Communist Party.

REINFORCING A FICTION

To be sure, the Vietcong military forces include a number of indigenous southerners under northern control. Neither the United States nor the South Vietnamese Government has ever questioned that fact. But the composition of the Vietcong military forces is not the issue when one discusses the role of the front. The issue is whether the front has any color of claim as a political entity to represent these indigenous elements.

The evidence makes clear that it does not. It is purely and simply a fictitious organization created by Hanoi to reinforce a fiction. To recognize it as the representative of the South Vietnamese population would be to give legitimacy to that fiction.

The true party in interest on the enemy side—the entity that has launched the attack on the South Vietnamese Government for its own purposes, the entity that has created, controlled and supplied the fighting forces of the Vietcong from the beginning—is the North Vietnamese regime in Hanoi. And it is the failure of that regime to come to the bargaining table that has so far frustrated every effort to move the problem of South Vietnam from a military to a political solution.

In spite of these clear realities, we have not taken—nor do we take—an obdurate or unreasoning attitude with regard to the front. The President said in his state of the Union message, “We will meet at any conference table, we will discuss any proposal—4 points, or 14 or 40—and we will consider the views of any group”—and that, of course, includes the front along with other groups.

As the President has also said, this false issue of the front would never prove “an insurmountable problem” if Hanoi were prepared for serious negotiations. But we cannot, to advance the political objectives of the Communist regime in Hanoi, give legitimacy to a spurious organization as though it spoke for the people of South Vietnam.

EVERY BOUNDARY IMPORTANT

A European friend once critically observed that Americans have “a sense of mission but no sense of history.” That accusation is, I think, without warrant.

We do have a sense of history and it is that which enables us to view the war in South Vietnam for what it is. We Americans know that it is not, as I have said earlier, a local conflict; it is part of a continuing struggle to prevent the Communists from upsetting the fragile balance of power through force or the threat of force.

To succeed in that struggle, we must resist every Communist effort to destroy by aggression the boundaries and demarcation lines established by the postwar arrangements. We cannot pick and choose among those boundaries. We cannot defend Berlin and yield Korea. We cannot recognize one commitment and repudiate another without tearing and weakening the entire structure on which the world's security depends.

Some thoughtful critics of our Vietnamese policy both in Europe and America challenge this. They maintain that the West should not undertake to defend the integrity of all lines of demarcation even though they may be underwritten in formal treaties. They contend that many of these lines are unnatural since they do not conform to the geopolitical realities as they see them. They contend in particular that—since the passing of colonialism—the Western Powers have no business mixing in the affairs of the Asian mainland. They imply that—regardless of our commitments—we should not try to prevent Red China from establishing its hegemony over the East Asian landmass south of the Soviet Union.

INACCURATE PREMISE

Proponents of this view advance two principal arguments to support their thesis.

They contend that the very weight of Chinese power, its vast population and its consequent ability to mobilize immense mass armies entitles it to recognition as the controlling force of southeast Asia.

As a second reason for acknowledging the Chinese hegemony, they contend that for centuries China has maintained a dominant cultural and political influence throughout the area.

They claim, therefore, that southeast Asia lies within the Chinese sphere of influence and that we should let the Chinese redraw the lines of demarcation to suit themselves without regard to the wishes of the southeast Asian people.

This argument, it seems to me, does not provide an acceptable basis for U.S. policy.

The assertion that China through hundreds of years of history has held sway over south-

east Asia is simply not accurate. Successive Chinese empires sought by force to establish such sway, but they never succeeded in doing so, except in certain sectors for limited periods. For the people of southeast Asia have, over the centuries, shown an obstinate insistence on shaping their own destiny which the Chinese have not been able to overcome.

To adopt the sphere-of-influence approach now advocated would, therefore, not mean allowing history to repeat itself. It would mean according to China a status it had never been able to achieve by its own efforts throughout the ages. It would mean sentencing the peoples of southeast Asia against their will to indefinite servitude behind the Bamboo Curtain. And it would mean turning our back on the principles that have formed the basis of Western policy in the whole postwar era.

Nor can one seriously insist that geographical propinquity establishes the Chinese right to dominate. At a time when man can circle the earth in 90 minutes, there is little to support such a literal commitment to 19th century geopolitics. It is a dubious policy that would permit the accidents of geography to deprive peoples of their right to determine their own future free from external force. The logic of that policy has dark implications. It would rationalize the greed of great powers. It would imperil the prospects for developing and maintaining an equilibrium of powers in the world.

The principles of the United Nations Charter are doctrinally more in tune with the aspirations of 20th century man.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

This does not mean, however, that the political shape of the world should be regarded as frozen in an intractable pattern; that the boundaries established by the postwar arrangements are necessarily sacrosanct and immutable. Indeed, some of the lines of demarcation drawn after the World War II were explicitly provisional and were to be finally determined in political settlements yet to come. This was true in Germany, in Korea, and South Vietnam as well.

But those settlements have not yet been achieved, and we cannot permit their resolution to be preempted by force. This is the issue in Vietnam. This is what we are fighting for. This is why we are there.

We have no ambition to stay there any longer than is necessary. We have made repeatedly clear that the United States seeks no territory in southeast Asia. We wish no military bases. We do not desire to destroy the regime in Hanoi or to remake it in a Western pattern. The United States will not retain American forces in South Vietnam once peace is assured.

The countries of southeast Asia can be nonaligned or neutral, depending on the will of the people. We support free elections in South Vietnam as soon as violence has been eliminated and the South Vietnamese people can vote without intimidation. We look forward to free elections—and we will accept the result as a democratic people is accustomed to do. Yet we have little doubt about the outcome, for we are confident that the South Vietnamese who have fought hard for their freedom will not be the first people to give up that freedom to communism in a free exercise of self-determination.

Whether the peoples of the two parts of Vietnam will wish to unite is again for them to decide as soon as they are in a position to do so freely. Like other options, that of ramification must be preserved.

A SHARED INTEREST

In the long run, our hopes for the people of South Vietnam reflect our hopes for people everywhere. What we seek is a world living in peace and freedom—a world in which the cold war, with its tensions and conflicts, can recede into history. We are seeking to build a world in which men and nations will recognize and act upon a strongly

shared interest in peace and international cooperation for the common good.

We should not despair of these objectives even though at the moment they may seem rather unreal and idealistic. For we would make a mistake to regard the cold war as a permanent phenomenon. After all, it was less than two decades ago that Winston Churchill first announced in Fulton, Mo., that "From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the continent." And two decades are only a moment in the long sweep of history.

During the intervening years, major changes have taken place on both sides of the Iron Curtain. A schism has developed within the Communist world. The Soviet Union has become the second greatest industrial power. The Soviet people have begun to acquire a stake in the status quo, and after the missile crisis of 1962 the Soviet Union has come face to face with the realities of power and destruction in the nuclear age and has recognized the awesome fact that in the 20th century a war between great powers is a war without victory for anyone.

The changes taking place within the Soviet Union and among the nations of Eastern Europe are at once a reality and a promise.

Over time—and in a world of rapid and pervasive change the measurement of time is difficult indeed—we may look forward to a comparable development within Communist China—a maturing process that will deflect the policies of Peiping from bellicose actions to a peaceful relation with the rest of the world.

After all, it is not the American purpose simply to preserve the status quo. That was not our history and that is not our destiny. What we want to preserve is the freedom of choice for the peoples of the world. We will take our chances on that.

TOO MANY GI'S IN EUROPE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is now nearly 21 years since the end of World War II; yet Western Europe continues to leave its defenses entirely up to the United States. We are in Western Europe, in Germany, Spain, and France, and we are there in force. We are in West Germany as a conquering power.

Maintaining, as we do, more than a million men of our Armed Forces overseas in Asia, in Africa, and in Europe, the continued maintenance of those forces has caused a burden on the economy of our country. Is it not time, and in fact is the time not long past due, for us to withdraw most of our GI's from Europe? At least, if we do not withdraw most of them, is it not high time, and is the time not long past due, that we should withdraw at least 75 percent of the men of our Armed Forces from West Germany, France, and Spain?

Spain has recently joined with France in taking an antagonistic attitude toward the United States. The West German and French Governments should relieve us of some of the excess pressure. Why should not the highly prosperous nations of Western Europe defend themselves with their own soldiers from any threatened Russian aggression? In fact, any aggression from the Soviet Union at this time and during the past several years has seemed absolutely nonexistent. The Soviet Union is now a "have" nation and is no longer a "have not" nation. It is veering toward capitalism, but these

allies of ours are not only antagonistic to us in Western Europe, they have also given us no aid whatever in Vietnam.

De Gaulle and Franco have been critical of our messing into the civil war in South Vietnam.

Also, maintaining a large force in Western Europe has resulted in bad relations with the civilian population and the dependents of our soldiers. German and French Government leaders keep their own forces smaller. We bear their burden. The outflow of gold from our country is not really due to American tourists traveling abroad. Unfortunately, at this time we are maintaining 340,000 men and officers of our Armed Forces in West Germany, France, and Spain. In addition, we maintain approximately 298,000 dependents there. Also, officials of our State and Defense Departments foolishly entered into an agreement—I believe that is something we owe to the State Department—with the West German Government to employ only German nationals as clerks in our commissaries, PX's, and other facilities, thereby depriving some wives of GI's of an opportunity to be gainfully employed. Wives of our noncommissioned officers with grown children and other dependents qualified for employment and wishing to work are denied gainful employment in favor of German nationals who are quite frequently officious and incompetent. The cost of maintaining our troops plus the expenditures of service families compelled to rent houses and apartments of German and French landlords at exorbitant prices have helped reduce our gold reserves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Spanish dictator, Franco, also profiteers at our expense; and just recently he ordered further restrictions on the operation of our Air Force planes from the bases in Spain for which we pay very high rents.

Defense Secretary McNamara would do well to order the immediate return of at least 100,000 men of our Armed Forces and 150,000 of their dependents from France, Spain, and West Germany. Hereafter, officers and men should be sent for a tour of duty in Europe of not more than 13 months instead of 2 or 3 years; and their dependents should not be allowed to accompany them.

Finally, may I emphasize the fact that the present budget for West Germany provides only 2½ percent of the total budget for national defense whereas our budget provides approximately 63 percent for our national defense. The time is long past due for us to quit catering to the West Germany Government and its leaders. Our President and his advisers in the State Department should not concern themselves over whether or not the feelings of the civilian leaders of that country or of other West Euro-

pean governments would be hurt because we finally after all these years return to the United States a substantial number of our servicemen and their dependents. In view of the fact that these allies have refused to send any soldiers to aid us in Vietnam, thousands of these trained soldiers of the United States should be returned home and then reassigned to duty where they are really needed. Furthermore, operation airlift demonstrated we have the capability of airlifting an entire armored division with complete equipment, armor, tanks, artillery, and munitions battle ready from continental United States to Europe in less than 48 hours.

Mr. President, I have recently received a great many letters substantiating my position in this matter from constituents who presently are serving with our Armed Forces in Western Europe or are the dependents of men who are stationed there, and also from some who have recently returned from that duty. The comments and viewpoints in three of these letters are so clearly, precisely, and logically set forth that I commend them to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that three such letters, from two of which I have deleted the name and rank of the officer who wrote the letter, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Box 5357-R, APO N.Y., 09633,

November 28, 1965.

Hon. STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: After 2 months in Germany I am forced to agree with your recent proposal to withdraw a substantial portion of our forces. I have visited, talked to, and observed many American military personnel of high and low rank and believe they are living exceedingly well. Those who are not (particularly senior noncommissioned officers) choose to live in substandard economy quarters to save money. In driving through the former U.S. sector of Germany it appears that literally dozens of towns have U.S. military garrisons, complete with all the trappings of peacetime service—PX, clubs, etc. In Wiesbaden the Air Force has a recently expanded shopping center that can best be described as a department store in the heart of Germany. The line soldiers in the field do really soldier. But, as I am sure you know, for each of them there are six or seven behind them—supply, clerical, medical, dependents, civilian employees (civil service, industry, technical representatives, teachers, nonappropriated fund, etc., United States as well as German). Drastic consolidations or elimination of nonessential activities and reductions in personnel are definitely in order. Elimination of superfluous tactical units, as you have proposed, should trigger a corresponding decrease in administrative activities.

It is obvious to me that the Germans, especially those in low-level positions of authority, do not like us and do not want us here. They tolerate us because it is to their material advantage to do so. They insult Americans and kick them around at every opportunity, but we continue to take it and subsidize their economy. The Teutonic traits of superiority have not changed and "Deutschland über Alles" is still the national creed.